

# The London Quarterly and Holborn Review

JANUARY, 1945

## MORITURI

THE gladiators' cry, as they marched round the arena before engaging in deadly combat, still stirs the blood — 'Ave, Caesar, te morituri salutamus' — 'Hail, Caesar, we who are about to die, salute thee'. But it is not the acknowledgment of mortality in its imminent approach that I wish to stress, but the mere incontrovertible fact, whether we are climbing or going down the hill, whether we are living in seeming security or plunged in hazardous enterprise. What is the lesson of our mortality? How should we live our lives accordingly?

Certainly it means limitation, definite limitation. The days of our years are three score years and ten, says the Hebrew Psalmist, and if by reason of strength they be four score years, yet is their strength labour and sorrow; for it is soon cut off and we fly away. Do we, then, live and act as if aware of the limitation? The time is short at the best. The millennial Methuselah belongs to the primeval age. When our time is finished we cannot influence the after time very much. How much? is the pertinent question we ask. Certainly we should consider how far we can affect those who come after us. Footprints on the sands of time? Yes, the great men may leave these, but not even they always; and in any case, mark, it is sands; and those sands, as another poet reminds us in a different metaphor but to the same purpose, are surely 'sinking'.

*Morituri*, then — it is a salutary word. For this is that which happens to everyone; and yet it seldom comes on the onlooker without surprise — to die. Queen Gertrude only feigns acceptance of the fact. She has connived at her consort's murder. Conscience-stricken, she is vexed that her son should still mourn his dead sire. 'To die is common', she says, by way of impatient rebuke; and Prince Hamlet, from yearning depths, exclaims,

Aye, madam, it is common.

What then? The fact is inescapable, ineluctable, says Virgil. Only a Saint Paul can sublimate it, with what E. V. Lucas calls magnificent irony — 'O Death, where is thy sting? O Grave, where is thy victory?' Plato and Thomas Hardy are — momentarily at least — overwhelmed with the futility of our allotted span. A brief parenthesis betwixt two eternities, say they, though either faces the fact in his own individual way. But not resentfully, as did that friend of Lady Oxford, whom she describes as protesting at being entered, against his will, for the stakes of immortality; nor despairingly, as Koheleth or Omar Khayyám, as rendered by FitzGerald.

- The realization and acceptance of the fact is fundamental to all real achievement in our actual lives. Those who have sought escape from the fact for themselves — the Rosicrucians, for instance, and all those who have entered on

that will o' the wisp quest, the Elixir of Life — as well as those who, like Tithonus, have, without due thought, accepted the escape as a boon from the gods, all these, I say, have seen their day draw to a pitiful close of *fainéance*. Tennyson, brooding on it all, has put his findings in the lips of that same Tithonus:

Let me go: take back thy gift:  
Why should a man desire in any way  
To vary from the kindly race of men,  
Or pass beyond the goal of ordinance  
Where all should pause, as is most meet for all?

But this same poet has given a more heartening verdict in another poem, *Ulysses*. There is a wise acceptance of the fact of death, and therewith a noble resolve to redeem the time that remains:

How dull it is to pause, to make an end,  
To rust unburnish'd, not to shine in use!  
As tho' to breathe were life. Life piled on life  
Were all too little, and of one to me  
Little remains: but every hour is saved  
From that eternal silence, something more,  
A bringer of new things; and vile it were  
For some three suns to store and hoard myself,  
And this gray spirit yearning in desire  
To follow knowledge like a sinking star,  
Beyond the utmost bound of human thought.

The mood of the Victorian sceptic is sombre, yet not fundamentally at variance with the more joyous spirit of pagan Homer. Odysseus visits the Underworld and converses with the shades of the heroes. He greets Achilles, who sorrowfully makes answer: 'Nay, speak not comfortably to me of death, O great Odysseus. Rather would I live on ground as the hireling of another; with a landless man who had no great livelihood, than bear sway among all the dead that be departed.'

By inference, then, says Homer, we must make the most of the time we have here on earth. Sports in Elysium, and lolling on beds of amaranth, are insubstantial things. Even the Hebrew poet views Sheol with dismay, the hour when he shall go hence and be no more; and the very phrase I quoted above — redeeming the time — comes from one who lived in the positive and glorious assurance of a blessed resurrection.

A clear knowledge and acknowledgment of our finiteness is preconditional, I repeat, to all positive achievement in life. We must recognize we have not all eternity before us on this planet. Whence come all our wars and rumours of wars but from this overweening, short-sighted, blear-eyed conceit of ourselves? As if our sound and fury signified something! We do not even leave any permanent trace on earth's landscape. Kindly nature, our foster-mother, will in a short season or two obliterate all traces of our gun-emplacements, our escarpments, our trenches and dug-outs, our infernos of Pharsalia, Blenheim, Waterloo and Passchendaele:

As the ground was before, thus let it be —  
And Ardennes waves above them her green leaves.

No, if we would do some deed of note it must be by some other means than war. The world-conquerors have been the great mistakers in this. Their empires have vanished and left not a wrack behind. Alaric, Attila, Tamerlane, Jenghiz Khan — what are they to-day but names? If they are more than names it is for something else than their wars, their battles and sieges, that they are held in remembrance. Alexander the Great has his eponymous city of Alexandria. But easily his greatest, his most lasting contribution to human civilization was the involuntary one of a New Testament written in Greek. Julius Caesar is best remembered in our island by 'a kind of conquest' he made here, 'but made not here his brag of came and saw and overcame'. In Europe his name is commemorated in the titles Kaiser and Tsar, but even these have ceased to exist. Is Philippi more held in remembrance because of its battle and the ghostly visitant on the eve of battle, or because of the Holy Ghost that inspired two prisoners, a century later, to sing hymns at midnight, when they were fast in the stocks, and their prison shook with an earthquake? From the battlefield emerged Augustus, with his mission of the Roman empire: from the prison the apostle, with his mission of the Christian evangel. The Roman empire, after many vicissitudes, and — let it be conceded — much glory, has passed away. Every Whitsuntide commemorates the birth of the Christian Church. Napoleon is better remembered by the Code of Laws that bears his name than by any of his dazzling victories. So it has been with the would-be world conquerors of the past: so, we may be sure, will it be with their sedulous apes in our own day. Of every madman of North, South, East or West, Dr. Johnson's words are true:—

He left a name at which the world grew pale,  
To point a moral or adorn a tale.'

Even the monuments men build of set purpose to commemorate their names and achievements have no guarantee of perpetuity. The monuments may remain, but the name of their builder is either forgotten or with difficulty recalled. Witness the Pyramids. Or the monument itself ceases to be a monument, becomes indeed a mockery:—

'My name is Ozymandias, king of kings:  
Look on my works, ye Mighty, and despair!  
Nothing beside remains. Round the decay  
Of that colossal wreck, boundless and bare,  
The lone and level sands stretch far away.

*Litera scripta manet*, says the votary of literature; but even literature is not an unfailing memorial, Horace and Shakespeare notwithstanding. These certainly shall 'not all die', the one having built his *monumentum aere perennius*, the other his 'rhyme' — what understatement! — more 'powerful' than bronze or marble. Cicero, too, knew what debt was due to an Archias who could immortalize by letters. But Herbert Spencer writes mighty tomes to fill a shelf; and who beyond the intellectual *élite* even knows the name of the philosopher of

Evolution? Socrates writes nothing himself, but his name lives after two thousand years and more, doubtless — let me be fair — in large measure because of the kind offices of that same literature.

On the whole, then, it would seem that luck, fickle chance, as well as intrinsic worth, determines the abidingness of aught we say or think or do. He is a wise man who realizes the relativity of such a word as 'immortal'. It is foolish even, as well as presumptuous, to talk of shaping history for 'the next thousand years'. Better leave the millenniums to Him to Whom they are but as a watch in the night.

So far from gazing at the horizons of time and space we should humbly recognize the limit of our impact on our own immediate environment. How far we may affect posterity is in the lap of the gods. But even for our own day and generation we should understand how short is our reach. A man can only serve his own generation, was a wise headmaster's comment on the new and unconventional methods of his successor. My ways are not as your ways, is true of human as well as divine relationships. Parents do well to remember this in dealing with their children.

Therewith goes the corollary — each generation must live its own life, form its own character and personality, work out its own destiny. It is a commonplace truth, but one that is constantly forgotten. It is often said — we die alone. Is it equally remembered that in this achievement of character — we live alone? The kindest father can only do so much for his son. That son must work out his own destiny. Hence the notorious failure of sons to repeat their fathers' success. Too much is taken for granted. Nowhere is the error more signally illustrated than in our religious profession. Because one generation is converted and baptized we expect the succeeding generations to grow up, as it were, automatic Christians. So dies real religion, genuine religious belief. Hence the paganism prevalent to-day throughout the world. We have been living on our spiritual capital. Now we are bankrupt. The hereditary principle will not work in religion. We cannot carry another generation on our shoulders. They must learn to walk for themselves. Christ's word to Nicodemus is addressed to every man that cometh into the world — 'Ye must be born again'.

J. MINTO ROBERTSON

### JABEZ BUNTING: A REVISED ESTIMATE

**E**VEN before Dr. Thomas Coke had died men were looking at Bunting and speculating about his future. The indefatigable Coke in his restless journeyings had no time to discharge his duties efficiently as Secretary of the Conference, and it was Jabez Bunting who in 1804 'ploughed', as he said, 'through acres of figures' in order to help Robert Lomas to bring order out of chaos.

In 1806 he was appointed assistant Secretary of the Conference, and, as he told his mother, it gave him a capital seat near to the President's chair where he could see and hear everything. It was now he began to show what the inscription to his memory in Wesley's Chapel, City Road, describes as the



'practical sagacity of a statesman and the comprehensive and far seeing wisdom of a legislator'. When the overworked Superintendent cries 'Satis' after the filling up of all his schedules he may not feel too kindly disposed to Jabez Bunting, but this fervent attention to detail enabled him so to organize Methodism that it withstood the shocks and testing of a lengthy transitional period. When we talk of his conservatism it is well to remember that he gained his end only after the opposition of senior Ministers who thought it was necessary to proceed with more caution. He had to fight to secure the nomination of laymen to have equal place with ministers on connexional committees. He also obtained the admission of laymen into District Meetings. Through his advice the Connexional funds were firmly established on a permanent basis.

But Bunting was not alone the master builder and Methodism's greatest statesman. To him more than to any other the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society owed its inception. He first established a district Missionary committee in Leeds (1813), and it became a model for the others which quickly sprang up over the country. When he became Connexional Editor in 1821 he persuaded the great Richard Watson to follow him in the Secretaryship of the Wesleyan Methodist Missionary Society, but he never ceased throughout his life to interest himself actively in this Society.

From earliest days he was concerned for the education of the preachers' children and through his insistence the property at Woodhouse Grove was secured in 1811. But it was an educated Ministry on which his heart was set and at last in 1834 he saw the consummation of his hopes in the founding of a theological Institution. Against his express desire he was made President of the Institution and remained so until his death.

But in none of these things, not even in his preaching and in his outstanding power in public prayer, did he make his greatest contribution to Methodism. His supreme and lasting work was in the strengthening of the Pastoral Office. No one can overestimate how much this meant to Methodism in the troubled years that followed Wesley's death.

It is necessary to remember that John Wesley had regarded his preachers (with the exception of ordained clergymen, and those he had ordained) as little more than laymen. And to an even greater degree Charles Wesley had resented any encroachment on the prerogative of the ordained clergyman. The Methodist Preachers were not appointed to their sacred office by any of the set forms of ordination prescribed in other Christian Churches. They were not allowed to assume the title 'Reverend' though this was conceded to Ministers of other denominations. On the circuit plans they were classed with local preachers. They had no distinctive dress and were regarded by Mr. Wesley as his assistants. In the Armenian (later Wesleyan Methodist) Magazine they were referred to as Mr. —, Preacher of the Gospel. Although Wesley was compelled to take steps in the interests of his work, which made a later separation from the Church of England inevitable, he refused to face the logic of events. He was determined to live and die a member of the Church of England. So far as he was able he wanted his meeting houses to have their services outside Church hours so that his people could also attend the Parish Church, and he desired them to receive the Sacrament at the hands of the local clergyman. He was profoundly impressed by Ignatius Loyola and the work that the Society

of Jesus was able to do within the Roman Church. There is no doubt that in his mind he hoped that Methodism would be such a Society within the Church of England. It was one sign of his tremendous influence that his people loyally attempted to follow his wishes even when his plan was becoming increasingly unworkable. But by the close of the eighteenth century the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper was being administered in virtually all Methodist Chapels and Methodism was in effect a separate Church. What was now imperatively demanded was a man to recognize that a changed situation demanded a change of policy. It would not do for him to be as reckless and impetuous as Alexander Kilham, for that would only provoke hostility and opposition and perhaps precipitate another split. He needed to have both vision, and a cautious yet progressive statesmanship. Above all he needed tenacity of purpose and a willingness to wait and seize his opportunities as they came. The moment found the man. Jabez Bunting combined these qualities in a marvellous degree, and he, in the providential point of time, was able to form and direct the policy of the new Church struggling for articulate expression. When at a Quarterly Meeting of Local Preachers the examination into character took place and all the names of the preachers were read beginning with that of the Superintendent, Bunting objected. He declared that the proper place to have his name read was at the District Meeting and the Conference. Thus he drew an important distinction between the status of the local preacher and the full time itinerant preacher. It was through the influence of Jabez Bunting that the decisions of the Conference of 1793 and 1794 were revised, and the Conference of 1818 used the prefix of Rev. for its itinerant preachers.

At the Conference of 1836, with Jabez Bunting in the chair, thirty young men were received into full connexion and were ordained by the imposition of hands. His opponents saw in him the champion of the pastoral office and its authority. But this charge in truth was not to his discredit but to his glory.

Methodism could only have survived the transitional years in the early nineteenth century by giving to the Ministry a proper but not undue authority. This was not only necessary because Methodism had separated itself from the established Church and a fitting status for its ministers was demanded, but because democracy without responsible leadership becomes a rabble and so a prey to disorder and faction. There was another reason. The attempt of Lord Sidmouth to prohibit Methodist Local Preachers from preaching was defeated (1811), but it showed the possible danger to Methodism from above, if the Methodist Church lacked a constitution and ministers with a recognized standing. The labour troubles of these years and in particular the Luddite riots showed another possible danger from below. For if agitators with their heady enthusiasm and wild schemes could infect the Methodist people without let or hindrance, the whole Methodist Society might have been convulsed by violent disturbance and tumult. Bunting himself took a stand that might seem over-severe, and ministers followed his lead. But though they seemed unnecessarily harsh, their justification is that in troubled and unsettled times, the Methodist Church was able unhampered to progress in peace.

It does not need to be argued that the new status Bunting gave to the body of Wesleyan Methodist Ministers has been a source of permanent strength to the connexion. If a minister is a shuttlecock to be knocked to and fro by

contending parties, he cannot either serve the Church effectively nor can the Church do its proper work. He may not have much actual power, but he must be granted the moral influence due to his office if the peace and prosperity of Zion is to be kept. Weaken the position of Ministers and you weaken the authority of the Church, for you expose yourself to dangers against which you have no effective safeguard.

The tragedy of Bunting, if the phrase be permitted, is that having made Methodism strong and secure he did not realize that further reforms and concessions could be made which would strengthen the position of the laity without weakening the position of the Ministry. If with his towering greatness he had more elasticity and tolerance, the agitation which split Methodism in the mid-century might have been avoided. But he had been *facile princeps* for so long, and had initiated so many reforms that he could not easily believe that the time had come for still further advance, and that he was holding up the traffic. Nor did he realize that a domination of Conference as complete as his own was injurious to the growth of a free, democratic body of opinion. Had he always been as infallible as he was benevolent, it would still have been harmful for Methodism to have been kept in swathing bands. It is true that in the later agitation much of the opposition to him was unworthy and vicious, but at the start it was some of the most respected Ministers who ranged themselves against him.

This was most noticeable in the Conference of 1844. Benjamin Gregory, whose famous 'Sidelights' must be balanced by such a history as that of George Smith, did not hesitate to say the 1844 Conference 'marked a turning point in the ecclesiastical politics of Wesleyan Methodism'. Gregory's point was that previously it had always been impossible successfully to protest against the judgments of Dr. Bunting, but now although he was in the Chair for the fourth time, successive resolutions were carried against his strongly expressed desires. At last a definite crisis arose. When a memorial was presented to the Conference that the Rev. R. Ray be appointed a Governor of Taunton School the Rev. G. Osborn and Dr. Beaumont moved that the request be granted. When it seemed obvious that this motion to which he objected would be passed Bunting rose abruptly and cried 'Let me go home. It will be a relief to my conscience, I will sign the Minutes'. To the general consternation he left the Chair, and only with the greatest difficulty was he persuaded to return. Bunting gained his point by *force majeure* and the name of a Governor for Taunton was not inserted in the Minutes. But he had acted more clearly against the wishes of the Conference and a strained relationship resulted. It cannot be doubted that Bunting went far beyond the limits of Presidential authority when he overrode the wishes of the Conference, and decided for himself the judgment it ought to give. From this Conference onwards there was a second body of opinion which could quickly be mobilized to safeguard the rights of free speech, and in especial, the holding of views contrary to the dominant party in the Conference. Nothing could show more clearly the restiveness of the 1844 Conference than the fact that Jacob Stanley, whose sturdy independence had invoked official displeasure, was now elected President with a higher vote than Bunting had obtained the year before. The times were certainly changing.

It must always be regretted that Jabez Bunting who was a very Prince among

his brethren, should not have discerned more readily the signs of the times. His imperious unyielding attitude gave the Philistines cause to rejoice, inspired the scurrilous attack of the Fly Sheets, and precipitated the disastrous secessions of the 'fifties. But when we go back in memory to the Conference in Birmingham over a hundred years ago, regret at the clouding sky must not prevent us recognizing, that in the middle period of Methodism, the greatest name was that of Jabez Bunting.

MALDWYN EDWARDS

### DISCIPLINE IN THE DEVOTIONAL LIFE

THE mere mention of discipline in connection with devotional life almost inevitably suggests asceticism. Pictures rise in the mind of caves and hermits, hair shirts and fastings, lugubrious countenances and nasal psalm-singing, the grey dress of Quakers, the dour old Scottish Sabbath, the sternness of early Methodists, the pokebonnets of the Salvationists. In our ever-changing world of circumstance an attitude of mind which demands strict control of the body seems to be a permanent spiritual feature. It is a subject which demands attention in the spiritual development of every thoughtful Christian, especially in an age when terrible suffering and national catastrophe may go hand in hand with cavalier lightheartedness and ironic disdain. People even to-day are inclined to dismiss grave portents of sin with an airy gesture, as though they were insubstantial as Prospero's pageant.

However we may be prejudiced against its practices, the presence of asceticism in the religious life cannot be overlooked. The word 'askeesis' originally signified the training of athletes and the necessary attendant discipline in preparation for Greek games. The word has passed completely out of use in connection with sport, but the memory of its use in that connection should help us to look for and recognize what is healthy and constructive in any asceticism recommended in the practice of religion. It is now entirely a religious term, and, so far as physical fitness is concerned, we now speak of soldiers and sailors, boxers and running men as being 'in training'. The man in the suburban train on a bleak February day in times of peace ruffles his newspaper and casually remarks to his neighbour that Cambridge rowed a lock-to-lock trial yesterday in good time despite a snowstorm. He does not feel how necessary it is, not only that eight men should endure a snowstorm while clad in the thinnest of vests and trunks, but that every day their appetites and pleasures should be restricted by time-tables, diet-charts and exercises. All that is undergone to achieve perfect fitness of body is done with much the same fervour as was anciently to be seen in the life of the religious ascetic. The history of religion shows us men of almost every country and age practising asceticism, the best of them with no idea of winning praise and notoriety from men, but simply to attain purer communion with God. The Hindu fakir and the Hebrew prophet, the Greek of the Socratic school who believed in the soul as a prisoner in the body, or the later Stoics and Cynics, with their contempt for material benefit, all are of this great brotherhood. Their practice was caught

up into Christianity. In the early days of the Church especially we may notice how there was a spiritually athletic enthusiasm in their daily disciplined life because of the expectation of the reappearance of our Lord. The prayer, 'Come, Lord Jesus', had not simply the wistfulness we often impart into it, the nostalgia of a hard-pressed soul, but healthy expectancy and true strength.

In succeeding centuries ascetic practices were variously developed and modified — the pendulum swinging from one extreme of indulgence to the opposite extreme of utmost rigour. But continually the ideal of a disciplined life was associated with some kind of ascetic practice. Long before the division was made in the ranks of the Christians between those who remained in the world and those who withdrew from it as 'professed religious', a healthy modicum of ascetic practice was common, as it would be again, for instance, among the early followers of Wesley. The very ready acceptance of what Dr. Kirk has called 'the doctrine of the two lives' was, however, fraught with the possibility of establishing an impassable gulf between the cloister and the street, celibacy and the married state, and in the former of these categories alone could full Christian discipleship be fostered.

There were those who tended to regard the distinction as one of *degree* only. The Christian life is a life of progress. It passes through its stages; its end is contemplation or the vision of God, and this is the 'highest' stage. All that comes below is the preparatory discipline of the 'active life' — a discipline meaningless and incomplete unless it ends in the vision. That is the one line of thought; the second is quite different. The two lives differ not in degree, but in *kind*; the 'contemplative' life aims at vision, the "active" at some other and lower goal. By the grace of God even the man "in the world" can attain salvation if he brings forth fruits worthy of repentance; but the highest rewards are for ever closed to him. He has turned his back upon the nobler course.

(K. E. Kirk, *The Vision of God*.)

It was the pursuit of this second, invalid way which brought the growth of so many various 'rules' for devout living which survive from the Middle Ages, whether we turn to books written for the great monastic orders, like the famous Benedictine Rule, or to codes drawn up by superior clergy and visitors for individuals or tiny communities like that of the three anchoresses for whom the 'Ancren Riwele' was written about the year 1210. Thomas à Kempis preserves much of the best advice of his day, and improves upon it. Wesley swiftly included him among the authors he would have his followers read, though probably the early Methodist, like the modern reader, could completely overlook the fact that À Kempis expected his maxims only to be capable of practice within the life of the cloister.

The Reformation did much to sift the wheat from the chaff — and in the new world of the hearty Elizabethan Age it was possible not only for men to revolt from imposed Church discipline but to laugh at the motives behind asceticism. This would scarcely have been possible among the pilgrims with whom Chaucer went to Canterbury. 'Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale?' is not merely a typical Shakespearean sally. It is a reflection of current opinion, represented by the 'greasy multitude'



as well as by the young grandees lolling on the stage, and tilts at the growing minority of the Puritans. In that age many men were ready to fling down the reins and let Brother Ass, the body, go as he would, at trot, amble or gallop, and his rider, the soul, had little cause for alarm. But there was the alert minority; and Shakespeare had been laid to rest in Stratford only twenty-six years when, in 1642, the theatres were closed by Parliament. An immediate consequence was that John Milton, the greatest of the Puritans, was not able to proceed with his scheme for a great drama on the Fall of Man but had to be content with epic form for his *Paradise Lost*. The Puritan minority had in those few years come to moral and political power. Once more the ascetic way of life could impose a curb upon the careless, not simply by moral suasion but by the law of the land. Though that rule of 'the saints' was shortlived in England, it left a deep mark on life in America. Thereafter, in England, every revival of religion called for a check upon man's self-indulgence. In the eighteenth century it came through Methodism. In the early nineteenth century it came with the Oxford Movement into High Anglican circles and, later, General Booth's Salvation Army ensured its power at the opposite end of the religious scale.

Thus, even in such a slight sketch as the above, it becomes obvious that asceticism of some kind is inseparable from the course of Christianity.

Here, however, we need to distinguish between an ascetic view of life itself as a whole and the discipline which may call for certain ascetic practices or, at least, definite exercises affecting spiritual and bodily habits. In asceticism proper there is an inherent belief with which we must be in the strongest dissent. The real, thoroughgoing ascetic believes that flesh and spirit are necessarily enemies and one must triumph at the expense of the other. Robert Browning's prayer for a state of life in which 'nor soul helps flesh more now than flesh helps soul!' is not only unutterable, it is mad. This complete asceticism is not of itself Christian even though it impinged closely upon early Christian thinking; but it won no victory in the age of the Gospels and the Epistles. It is not traceable in the reported words of Jesus, though expectation of self-denial is laid continually upon His disciples. We hear the note of urgency in Paul:

I delight in the law of God after the inward man; but I see a different law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity under the law of sin which is in my members. Oh, wretched man that I am! who shall deliver me out of the body of this death? I thank God through Jesus Christ our Lord.

The distress has turned to triumph, but this is not the kind of triumph the complete ascetic ever knows. If Paul would buffet the body to bring it into subjection, it is at length to be harmonious subjection, not a stifled, choking, writhing existence in which the soul almost kills the body, but dare not quite do it lest (what a paradox it is!) by making its victory too complete it also should commit the deadly sin of suicide and find itself in the spiritual world before its appointed time. The ascetic deeply believed in this enmity of soul and sense. In that 'Rule of Anchoresses', mentioned above, the teacher remarks to his pupils in their Dorsetshire house that after blood-letting, they should rest



quietly for three days. He would temper rigorous practices with mercy. Blood-letting! It is a casement-window, narrow in its aperture, but wide enough to give us a view of the dark country of the true ascetic's life, with all its mordant possibilities fitfully illuminated by a lightning of hysterical vision. Tennyson's picture of Simeon Stylites would seem fantastic, did we not know how truly it describes what actually happened.

I will not cease to grasp the hope I hold  
Of saintdom, and to clamour, mourn and sob,  
Battering the gates of heaven with storms of prayer,  
Have mercy, Lord, and take away my sin.  
Let this avail, just, dreadful, mighty God,  
This not be all in vain, that thrice ten years,  
Thrice multiplied by superhuman pangs,  
In hungers and in thirsts, fevers and cold,  
In coughs, aches, stitches, ulcerous throes and cramps,  
A sign betwixt the meadow and the cloud,  
Patient on this tall pillar I have borne  
Rain, wind, frost, heat, hail, damp and sleet and snow.

Christianity, as it is shown to us in the New Testament, never demands such living as that exemplified in many of those saints who were followed enthusiastically in cloister and desert. We no longer view the legitimate demands of nature as being at enmity with righteousness. Monastic life persists, and narrowness of outlook has not been eliminated from some strict evangelical sects; but the vast majority of Christians see a large liberty which they cherish. What necessity exists for any kind of ordered discipline?

If there is any such need, we should not obscure the fact that it is definitely the means to an end and not an end in itself. We can also quite dismiss any thought that the best way to atone for sin is to persecute ourselves. It is strange and sad that religious people have so often and so long tried to incur merit by their own sufferings, deliberately inflicted. A God who looked with favour upon His children because they made themselves miserable, wounded, bereft of freedom of movement, would not seem, whatever else He might be, identical with the God Whom Jesus taught us to address as 'Our Father'.

The aim of the Christian is to worship God, and a direct product of worship is the living of the Christlike life. The purpose of the Church is to foster that aim and succour her children with means of grace which will help them towards their goal. 'I live, yet not I, but Christ liveth in me', is a classic expression of our ambition, and shows the only way by which we can ever hope to fulfil our Lord's injunction, 'Be ye therefore perfect, even as your Father which is in heaven is perfect'. It is our joy to publish the truth that Christ lives on, doing His beneficent work, sweetening life, endearing us to our toil and place by ties of love, fellowship and duty which have their own incentive and yield their own reward. This word 'reward' is closely associated with the motive of the thoroughgoing ascetic. The communist who tilts at us about 'pie in the sky' can find plenty of support. If he opens the popular Catholic 'Small Missal' he sees that the faithful are bidden to pray daily, 'I desire to gain all the indulgences that I can'; and among evangelicals there

are many hymns which reveal the same hankering. The best type of Christian has risen above these thoughts; he finds rewards continually in his attempts to deny himself and carry the Cross. It is most fitting that a Jesuit, Francis Xavier, wrote:

Not with the hope of gaining aught,  
Not seeking a reward,  
But as thyself hast lovèd me,  
O ever-loving Lord.

The best guide to the true nature of religion is the finest religious life. We win our theories out of successful discipleship and not our most Christlike living out of complicated theory. To become expert in Aquinas is no guarantee of saintliness; yet we do trust most deeply those theologians whose lives reflect something of 'the beauty of Jesus'. For our religion is a living, God-directed power in the personalities of men and women. It has a philosophy of life and Nature, but the philosophy is inextricably bound up with the business of daily life, the market and the home, the sanctuary and the school. The Christian whose life is of more obvious power than his intellectual expression of it is heeded by the world. The critic, whose criticisms are not reinforced by moral ascendancy, is not to be feared. It is this lack of moral value in the characters of some modern critics of the Church which renders them comparatively harmless, though very irritating.

Bearing this principle in mind, we will glance at a few types of the good life. All have been conspicuous in devotion to Christ, and able to achieve large and fine practical results because of the inwardness of their personal faith and unmistakable allegiance to the fundamental precepts of their Saviour. It will only be fair, since we seek evidence of a very general nature, that we should look at men representing different expressions of our common faith. As C. S. Lewis has remarked with the spiritual adroitness which is commanding such attention to-day, 'How monotonously alike all the great tyrants and conquerors have been: how gloriously different are the saints!'<sup>1</sup>

We begin where we are freest from traditional Church order and ritual, among the Quakers. Of all Christians none have been more careful to exclude what they hold to be inessential. In the modern world they have been the counterpart to the early Cistercians, and this both in piety and industry. The Quaker, while remaining in the world, was not of it. One of the most glorious names among the Friends is that of John Woolman who, a century before slavery was abolished in America, was fighting a religious campaign almost single-handed for the freedom of the negro slaves when even the Quaker community itself was hostile to their release. His life was singularly free from the rut of mere ritual which traps so many of us. Admittedly, he was eccentric, but always sincere. His great aim, so far as his personal devotional life was concerned, is expressed in his *Journal* in such sentences as the following:

The necessity of an inward stillness hath appeared clear to my mind . . .  
Being weaned from all things, except as they may be enjoyed in the Divine will, the pure light shines into my soul.

<sup>1</sup> *Beyond Personality*, p. 62.

Again, after exhorting those who are well endowed with this world's goods to bethink themselves of their dangers, he says:

Divine love imposeth no rigorous or unreasonable commands, but graciously points out the spirit of brotherhood and the way to happiness, in attaining which it is necessary that we relinquish all that is selfish.

The genius for conserving true Christian purity of life was not Woolman's alone; it has been markedly maintained among the Friends to the advantage of the whole world. The Quakers are always ready to be Good Samaritans, and are deeply sensitive to any affront which may be offered to the holy work of redeeming love. Mr. Masefield has paid tribute to this spiritual insight in the typical Quaker character in that realistic episode in *The Everlasting Mercy* where Saul Kane oversteps the wide boundary-mark of his pot-house friends' conduct by obscenely teasing the Quaker woman:

'Saul Kane', she said, 'when next you drink  
Do me the gentleness to think  
That every drop of drink accursed  
Makes Christ within you die of thirst,  
That every dirty word you say  
Is one more flint upon His way,  
Another thorn about His head,  
Another mock by where He tread,  
Another nail, another cross:  
All that you are is that Christ's loss.'

How have the best Quakers achieved their fine spiritual consciousness? Not in any haphazard way, but by a most thorough discipline which they have applied to the whole of life in a devotional spirit, habit and thought, motive and service, even speech itself, being subjected with dress to a close scrutiny.

Midway between Quakers and Rome we Methodists stand. We have much in common with the Quakers in general religious belief and practice, but, while denying the exclusive, sacerdotal element and authority of Catholicism, we have a love of Church Order which is obvious in all we do or undertake. The Methodist is a free churchman; but he is a churchman. A liturgy or an order of service, a constitution, a schedule of societies, a leaders' meeting — even a trustees'! — all these are crutches, but often we throw them away and leap jubilantly. As the local preacher said, when talking of the man healed at the Gate Beautiful, 'He walked into the Temple extempore!' But behind us always is the massive figure of Wesley, grown through the generations on a scale vastly beyond his actual physique. Can we touch his life anywhere without being impressed with these two facts? First, whatever he does is consciously a devotion to the glory of Christ; and, second, it is efficient because it is disciplined. It comes out in his *Twelve Rules of a Helper* which range from the blacking of boots and conversation with women to the winning of souls for Christ. His discipline is fashioned for the help of Members of the Society. Even their personal adornment and diversions are worth attention, and especially their devotional habits. We may smile at quaint phrases, but within them is the secret by which the fire, first kindled in Aldersgate Street, spread through England.

Modified by the needs of our modern fashion and vocabulary, and, we must admit, with less of the original bite than might be good for us, yet 'The Methodist Rule of Life' is printed in every Class-book. How many members ever hear it read? Yet whenever we come to a life which is typically Methodist, we see the fruit of this discipline. This kind of life has been seen in hundreds of villages, and in all the towns. It is shown in books. There is, for example, that little, widely beloved collection of the private prayers of Walter James — 'The Unveiled Heart'. It is in the hymnbook in scores of well-known verses, but never more completely than in W. M. Bunting's confession, so searching and detailed. How — apart from long effort and the discipline of love — could the son of the overbearing Jabez know these subtle gradations of the fatal sins of omission?

O how lightly have I slept  
With Thy daily wrongs unwept,  
Sought Thy chidings to defer,  
Shunned the wounded Comforter.

Woke to holy labours fresh  
With the plague-spot in my flesh,  
Angel seemed to human sight,  
Stood a leper in Thy light!

Perception of that kind belongs to the saints. Sin appears to be almost the only thing known to us which, the more one indulges in it, the less one really knows of its nature and effect. Sainthood has, as its disturbing element, sometimes seeming to scarify in order to sanctify the soul, this acute knowledge of the pain of sin. And the sign of spiritual growth is specially shown in knowledge of what has not been attempted, 'those things which we ought to have done', for the merest child in the faith understands the heinousness of major sins of committal.

We look next at the Church which has ever been most insistent that perfection of Christian life can never be won without implicit obedience to her commands and asks from her priests and professed orders the denial of ties which many of us hold to be as Divinely sanctioned as the Church herself. Rome seeks to stand foursquare to every wind that blows, unique, confident, authoritative, infallible. What mighty qualities these would be if the confidence never had the bluster of the bully, the authority were a little more constant to that winsomeness which drew children and sinners to follow the Carpenter, and if the infallibility could be made retrospective not simply in doctrine but in the lives of some very fallible Popes! It is impossible, without false division of function and human nature, to believe in an infallible Church and an Apostolic Succession which runs as a sort of pipeline into our troubled world via warlike cardinals and supposedly celibate Popes whose sons were conveniently called 'nephews'. But though we use our hard-won privilege of freedom to challenge every one of these positions, we dare not overlook or minimize the fact that wonderful discipleship to Christ has been possible in men and women who were Romans of the Romans in their loyalties.

Within the borders of the Catholic Church have been many whose lives have

won the deep affection and, with certain qualifications, the following of Free Churchmen. There is, for instance, that sturdy prophet, Alexander Whyte, with his strong attachment to St. Teresa and Newman. Our freedom as churchmen is shown precisely as we are able to learn from all who can instruct us in the true ways of spirituality within the Church Catholic where we cherish our own part.

The name of Newman will always be mentioned among Englishmen as that of a man whose sincerity could not be doubted. Whatever false motives of ambition, crossed plans or craving for absolutism may have drawn other men from their native communions, this man, at least, is free from blame. One cannot refrain from wishing that all men who prate of their authority and catholicism could be one-tenth as logical and self-sacrificial as Newman was. But we are here chiefly concerned with the fact that there are large similarities between these three 'Johns': Woolman, Wesley and Newman. Thomas Mozley said of Newman that he

filled up his whole time, taxed his whole strength and occupied his whole future . . . He reduced retrospection to very narrow compass, to a few faces, to flowers on a bank or wall, to a fragrance or a sound . . . He never took solitary walks if he could help it . . . Newman would not be left alone and left to his own thoughts when he was neither studying, nor writing, nor praying.

Newman's life was most obviously the life of conscious discipline. Wesley and Newman have not a little in common; and it is by no means inconceivable that, had he been born a century earlier, Newman might have been one of the leaders of the Evangelical Revival. If they could have met after they had left High Anglicanism and Oxford for their opposite ways, both of them ready to bear ignominy, both of them making large, conspicuous sacrifices with modesty and forbearance, they would have found much to respect in each other's life, certain constant common factors which remained though they gave allegiance to very different authorities. Newman's biographer, Dr. W. Barry, says that Newman carried thoroughness of life into everything he undertook. 'He enforces discipline of mind, still recommending exactness, balance, sharp watch'. Mark Pattison, in his *Memoirs*, remarks upon the same features when he himself was at Oriel and Newman was Dean. It is observable in his writing. English has seldom been better written than by Newman. He would write everything over three times until he meant what he said and said what he meant exactly, beautifully, and yet without denuding it of enthusiasm and conviction. In his cell at Edgbaston, as earlier in his retreat at Littlemore, the monastic life was seen in one who was not a monk. Yet, judged by a Catholic standard, Newman does not pass the highest test. 'The Divinely intended End of our Life is Joy overflowing and infinite, a Joy closely connected with a noble asceticism', says Baron Von Hugel; and elsewhere, concerning Newman himself, he writes:

I used to wonder, in my intercourse with John Henry Newman, how one so good, and who had made so many sacrifices to God, could be so depressing. And again, twenty years later, I used to marvel contrariwise, in my



intercourse with the Abbé Huvelin, how one more melancholy in natural temperament than even Newman himself, and one physically ill in ways and degrees in which Newman never was, could so radiate spiritual joy and expansion as, in very truth, the Abbé did. I came to feel that Newman had never succeeded in surmounting his deeply predestinarian, Puritan training; whilst Huvelin had nourished his soul, from boyhood upwards, on the Catholic spirituality as it flourished in St. Francis. Under the fine rule by which the Roman Catholic tribunals require for Canonization as distinct from Beâtification, that the Servant of God concerned should be proved to have possessed and to have transmitted a deep spiritual joy, Newman, I felt and feel, could indeed be beatified, but only Huvelin could be canonized.

(*Essays and Addresses*, Second Series, p. 242.)

Those are serious and discriminating judgments by a great authority on the spiritual life; but we need not fear the challenge implicit in them. Not only in men like Woolman and Wesley, but in many humble, obscure church members outside the Roman communion the signs of that veritable joy have appeared which are looked for in the canonized saint; and this joy was transmitted by them as they proclaimed with countless deeds, 'Oh, let me commend my Saviour to you'. But I have never met one such character who was not the child of grace and of discipline. This stands as one of the fundamental facts of Christian experience everywhere, that successful living is the product of definite devotion which cannot be maintained without discipline. That this discipline may be self-administered rather than imposed by a director, does not in the least detract from this truth. The graces of Christianity are not wild-flower beauties, blown on the winds of chance: they come where they are loved and cultivated. I remember a head gardener once approaching his employer with the request that one of his helpers should be transferred to the home farm from the house grounds. Asked whether the man was unsatisfactory and a poor worker, he hastened to say that he was a hard worker and he liked the man, 'But he does not love the flowers and they know it; they won't grow for him'. That was his way, I suppose, of expressing a deep, unconscious failing. Certainly, in the garden of the Lord, spiritual graces flourish only in souls who love Christ and are obedient to the discipline which is eager, positive and adjusted to the needs of the individual.

We may now pass to the final task of suggesting hints which may be useful to men seeking for fuller and richer spiritual practice. We have sought, by looking at ascetic practice in general and at conspicuously noble Christian lives, to find an irreducible minimum of fact. We oppose that asceticism which regards physical nature as something to be conquered because of its inherent evil, and we seek a harmony of body, soul and spirit in human life. We reject iron rule imposed externally, though we must be quick to recognize the advantage which comes when a seeker goes to a wise teacher in these matters. The present writer would be quick to acknowledge his great indebtedness to older men and friends, both ministerial and lay, who have helped him in that respect. The soul is too unique for one hard and fast set of rules to guarantee better attainment of Christian living and knowledge. Yet it is unmistakable that



every really spiritual life has its discipline, all the more effective because it has personal sanction and loving obedience, won through the consciousness of appeals that are made by the Holy Spirit.

But how much is this necessity openly recognized by the people who compose our Christian congregations? And how can ministers advise them concerning it when opportunity arises? For we may be quite sure that there will be no improvement in the evangelistic power of the Church as a whole until the life of prayer comes back to its rightful place. These issues may be approached in the light of personal experience.

We belong to a spiritual community that has always valued and practised the free access of the soul to God. Consequently there has arisen a real belief in men's ability to find God at any time, in any place, and almost in any way. That is perhaps true in what appears to be the way of life in the adult soul; but it has perils. Brother Lawrence found Christ 'among the pots and pans'; but the scullery would not be the first place to which a seeker after religious help should be sent. There are perils attaching to freedom, as we have noticeably discovered in other spheres of life during these past few years. And it is so with the spiritual life. Most men who confine themselves to extempore prayer in public worship or private devotion tend to fall into ruts of expression and desire. But, at the other extreme, are the folk so tied to 'prayer by the book' that, though they have ranged through all the liturgies and manuals of devotion, they are unable to utter five words of their own spontaneously to God.

It may therefore be useful to outline simple practices that have been of benefit to one man, over more than fifteen years of ministerial life.

He has found it indispensable to spend time every morning and evening in solitary devotional exercises. Regularity in time, and, as much as a wandering ministry will allow, in place, too, has been necessary. In the morning he reads a short passage in the Greek Testament, taking a couple of epistles and then a gospel in course. One of the psalms for the day precedes prayers in anthologies (such as *Great Souls at Prayer* or Dr. Fox's *A Chain of Prayer Across the Ages*) or a book of services. Then comes the prayer of silence, so uniquely valuable in the life that must inevitably do much talking, and therefore needs the corrective of listening! The needs of the world, political and international happenings, wars and calamities, and remembrance of the people in the circle of his acquaintance most in need, sick members, young people confronted with temptation, as well as members of his own family, all these come next in intercession. Evening prayers consist of reading in the English Bible (and periodically in the Vulgate) and a time in which prayers are not vocal but mental, followed by extempore prayer. Occasionally, especially if travelling or in particular moods of inability to concentrate, he will use the short offices of prime, vespers or compline as printed in *Divine Service* (Oxford) or the 1928 Prayer Book, or the excellent acts of devotion in the second half of *Divine Worship* (Epworth Press).

Apart from this daily scheme of private prayer, he has also found much help in going into some church other than his own to realize his own place in the wider ministries of a common faith. Again, especially in times when he has been troubled with aridity, his own insincerity, impatience with individuals

and definite conviction of personal sin, he has risen in the small hours of the morning for a brief devotion at a time when the world seems emptiest and most silent.

Once, following the advice of a senior friend, he worked meticulously through the purgative and illuminative exercises of J. Michael de Coutances which were originally framed for young Carthusians. These confronted him with perils he might have overlooked and revealed virtues and sins he had forgotten or had not yet learned to recognize. From time to time he refers to these or to other detailed spiritual exercises. But he is bound to admit that a devotional use of Wesley's original 'Hymns' shows an erudition every bit as wide and deep, and free from the censorship which is inevitable when a convinced Protestant uses Roman books.

These are a few ways, sufficiently disciplined for one life, at least, by which it is felt answer may come to the ancient prayer:

O Guide and Companion of our journey, make us study attentively and devoutly the example of Thy life, the writings of the Gospels and the maxims of the Saints, and learn from them and follow the true way of eternal life. May we feel Thee ever present in our hearts by grace, and have Thee for inseparable Companion on the road. May we carefully heed the more perfect ways shown us interiorly and walk them with Thee for Guide and Comrade. Amen.

HAROLD S. DARBY

## THE BONES OF JOSEPH: A STUDY IN EXODUS

ENJOYMENT of the Book of Exodus does not depend, happily enough, on questions of authorship. Let him who will arrange to his heart's content the various strands that go its composition, assigning this to J, and that to E, and something else to P. The ordinary reader, if he is wise, will find time to meditate upon the book itself, and be duly thankful that amongst the compilers, redactors, or what not, who brought it to its present form was someone with the mind and insight of a poet — someone who with the turn of a phrase can impart additional significance to a simple statement of fact which no translation into another tongue can obliterate. This is because the significance lies, not in the words which the original author used, but in the situation which he is describing — it is a significance of circumstance, which can be as fully appreciated by the modern English reader who is ignorant of Hebrew as by the profoundest student of the original. The indispensable requisite is sympathy, that divine quality which transcends all barriers, whether of time or place, enabling its possessor to discover the motives and hidden resources of a man long dead, even though he can conjure up no clear picture of his outward form.

Exodus tells the story of the beginning of a journey which has not ended yet, for the Jew, the present-day descendant of ancient Israel, is still looking for his Land of Promise. He is still wandering in the wilderness, and his homelessness remains one of the major problems of mankind, but that bane of statesmen does

not concern us here. The Israelites figure in our picture only as they serve to make more plain the man who led them, finding, through the heartbreak and utter disillusionment they caused him, the greatest prize of all. The picture is but a miniature, the study of one small section of a narrative that covers forty chapters, and yet complete enough to illustrate the book's peculiar charm, its power to make a few travel items eloquent of unutterable things. Here is the passage:

And it came to pass, when Pharaoh had let the people go, that God led them not by the way of the Philistines, although that was near; for God said, Lest peradventure the people repent when they see war, and they return to Egypt: but God led the people about, by the way of the wilderness by the Red Sea: and the children of Israel went up armed out of the land of Egypt. And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, for he had straitly sworn the children of Israel, saying God will surely visit you; and ye shall carry up my bones away hence with you . . . (Ex. xiii, 17-19).

Nothing could be easier than to read those verses at a glance and pass them by, but far more is said here than meets the eye. Why did God, intent on delivering His people from the oppressor, choose the longer route? Recent events have made all of us familiar with the map of the Eastern Mediterranean, and it is obvious that the shortest road from Egypt to Palestine is along the sea-coast—the nearer the sea the less the mileage, but God led them 'about', that is round about, through the wilderness of Sinai, and had abundant reason for so doing. The migrants might have arms in their hands, but they were still slaves in their hearts, and at the first glimpse of the warlike Philistines, whose country they would have been obliged to traverse on the coast road, they would have turned tail and bolted incontinently back to Egypt. Modern history shows that the emancipation of the slave is no summary business to be accomplished overnight. Great Britain and the United States know to their cost that it is one thing to buy out the slave-owner, or to compel him by force of arms to set his human chattels free, but quite another to eradicate the slave mentality. Servility is an ugly word for an uglier thing—it is a disease of the soul rather than a matter of economic status, and even God found that He could not transplant the slaves of yesterday from their bondage to the Land of Promise just as they were. In fact, the generation of the Exodus had to die because they could not abide the test of freedom, as the 95th Psalm reminds us. How many Christian churchgoers, chanting the Venite, realize the significance of the words that slip off the tongue so easily?

Forty years long was I grieved with this generation,  
And said, It is a people that do err in their hearts,  
For they have not known My ways:  
Unto whom I swear in My wrath,  
That they should not enter into My rest.

If God was baffled by their poor spirit and error of heart, how much more reason was there that from the outset Moses found the duty assigned him intolerable, and came near again and again to losing heart? Israelite though he was by birth, he had never been a slave, and there is all the difference in

the world between studying the problem of slavery in a palace, an interested aristocratic sympathizer, and being down there in the dirt and dust, attempting the impossible task of making bricks without straw, with the gang master's lash to remind the defaulter of the worse things that awaited him. It was exasperating enough to be brought into daily contact with such poor trash, but to be vilified by them as their worst enemy was past all bearing. 'He supposed that his brethren understood how that God by his hand was giving them deliverance but they understood not' (Acts vii, 25). Common fairness demands that we should acknowledge that the Israelites had a case against Moses. They had never asked to be set free, and would have been quite content if he had eased their hard lot by restoring the lost straw for their daily tally of bricks, or by a substantial improvement in their rations. Who knows but what the difference between him and them was aggravated by an air of authority that irked them all the more because their leader was unconscious of it, and that his very speech annoyed them? Did this palace-bred Israelite speak with the Egyptian equivalent of an 'Oxford accent', making everyday intercourse a trial which waxed to fury in a time of crisis. To them he was a meddling busybody who, by his unsought interference had brought them on a fool's errand, and they left him in no doubt at all as to their opinion of him — 'Because there were no graves in Egypt, hast thou taken us away to die in the wilderness? Wherefore hast thou thus dealt with us to bring us forth out of Egypt? Is not this the word that we spake unto thee in Egypt, saying, Let us alone, that we may serve the Egyptians? For it were better for us to serve the Egyptians than that we should die in the wilderness' (Ex. xiv. 11, 12). In the face of that, why did Moses persevere?

Part of the answer to that last question lies in the sentence which follows — 'And Moses took the bones of Joseph with him; for he had straitly sworn the children of Israel, saying, God will surely visit you; and ye shall carry my bones away hence with you.'

To appreciate what the bones of Joseph meant to Moses we must take note of the R.V. marginal reference to Genesis i. 25, reading not only that verse but the whole chapter, paying especial heed to the passage beginning at verse 14. There we read of the ancestors of these Israelites whom Moses is seeking, against their will, to lead to freedom, pleading for their brother's mercy, so little do they understand him. He had given them proof enough already of his magnanimity, and yet not enough to allay their fears. Now that Jacob their father is dead they think that he will turn and rend them, thus showing all too plainly their own quality. 'And Joseph said to them, Fear not; for am I in the place of God? And as for you, ye meant evil against me; but God meant it for good, to bring to pass as it is this day, to save much people alive. Now therefore fear ye not. I will nourish you and your little ones. And he comforted them, and spake kindly unto them.'

We have no means of knowing what the ordinary Israelite thought of the casket which contained the embalmed body of the deliverer of their forbears — possibly to him it was an object of superstitious awe and little more. Pride of race and sense of destiny had been crushed out of the Israelites since Joseph's day and, as we have good cause for remembering, the soul of a people can be corrupted all too quickly when freedom is withheld. With Moses it was differ-

ent — denied the sympathetic co-operation of his living fellow-countrymen, that casket was an invaluable reinforcement of faith. It offered the visible proof of a course completed and a mission achieved. To any doubts that the day's difficulties might bring, Joseph's confident 'God shall surely visit you' was the confident answer, for no man had better right than he to speak with certainty of God's overruling mercy. Who would have supposed that providential leading would include a sojourn at the bottom of a well into which jaundiced envy had lowered him, followed by a brotherly transaction whereby he became a slave in Potiphar's household? What happened there, and the sequence of events which brought him at last to the summit Moses knew full well — as also that other word of Joseph to his brethren after all the years that lay between — 'So now it was not you that sent me hither but God'. With such memories to fortify his own intercourse with God, how could he falter or draw back?

The bones of Joseph were laid to rest at last 'in Shechem, in the parcel of ground which Jacob bought', and as for Moses, 'no man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day', but faith is still sorely tried, and the multitudes still cry, 'Let us alone'. Those who are disillusioned with many aspects of the contemporary scene, wondering whether religion has any future, and grieving that faith has perished from the souls of men, would do well in their dark moments, when their own endeavours seem to count for nought, to take counsel with their forerunners, not merely in Holy Scripture, but in history that is wrongly called secular. Their story can be found in their biographies, and sometimes in the city street they stand above us, like the great President in Parliament Square in Westminster. How grateful we ought to be that he was allowed to remain there all through the blitz — one cannot think that, even in effigy, he would have been content to seek refuge in some cellar amongst the cobwebs! 'The tall, gaunt, stooping figure by his very presence in our midst reminds us: 'With malice toward none; with charity for all; with firmness in the right, as God gives us to see the right—let us strive on to finish the work we are in; to bind up the nation's wounds; to care for him who shall have borne the battle, and for his widow and his orphan; to do all which may achieve and cherish a just and lasting peace among ourselves, and with all nations'. (Second Inaugural Address.)

It is thus that across the generations great men inspire their successors, facing under the altered conditions of a new time the age-old enemies of ingratitude, misunderstanding, and ignoble fear of the new and untried way. It is not the leaders only who need that courage which the Epistle to the Hebrews calls 'Faith'. We all need it, and it was to men like ourselves, whose names remain unrecorded in any roll of fame that his exhortation was addressed 'Cast not away therefore your boldness, which hath great recompense of reward. For ye have need of patience, that having done the will of God, ye may receive the promise.'

Was it not great? Did he not throw on God

(He loves the burthen)

God's task to make the heavenly period

Perfect the earthen?

WILFRID L. HANNAM



## A COMPARISON OF McTAGGART'S TREATMENT OF 'LOVE' AND NYGREN'S TREATMENT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT 'AGAPE'

IT is strange to find in the works of an avowed atheist such a lofty conception of love as is found in McTaggart's philosophy. For he tells us that love is not only the highest reality in the universe but it is the sole reality. On the other hand Christianity holds God to be the highest reality, and the writer of the Johannine epistles tells us that God is Agape. The purpose of this essay is to compare McTaggart's idea of love with the exposition of the N.T. Agape as put forward by Nygren.

### I

In McTaggart's universe all that exists is Spirit, and the quality of spirituality is defined 'by saying that it is the quality of having content, all of which is the content of one or more selves'.<sup>1</sup> The selves are the primary parts of the universe; they alone are percipients. The secondary parts of the universe are perceptions. Thus the selves can only perceive themselves or other selves, and parts of themselves or parts of other selves, for nothing else exists. Thus McTaggart's universe is a community of selves bound together by mutual perception. We see this universe at the moment *sub specie temporis* but Time is in fact unreal, which is somewhat confusing when we come to speak of 'future' stages.

In spite of appearances to the contrary, McTaggart tells us that this perception of the selves by each other is always accompanied by love. Love is the fundamental emotion. 'In absolute reality the knowledge of other selves will always have one emotional quality . . . And the emotion which is always present is love.'<sup>2</sup> Love is a species of liking, but it is different from other species of liking in that it is always directed to persons, and not towards things. If we say we love mountains or cream cakes we misuse the word. Again, McTaggart only uses the word love for a liking which is intense and passionate. It is thus to be distinguished from benevolence and sympathy. Benevolence is only a desire to do good and we can do good to people whether we love them or not. So, too, we can sympathize with people whom we do not love, even though sympathy is an emotion. This love is sometimes associated with sexual passion, but it is also found in connection with other bonds of union — the love of a David and Jonathan or such love as is recorded in Tennyson's 'In Memoriam'.

We are told that this love is not always caused by pleasure, given by the loved person, for often love arises without any such pleasure, and when there is pleasure we do not necessarily love more because of the greater pleasure. Nor yet does love always lead to pleasure, nor does love involve moral approbation of the beloved, nor are benevolence and sympathy always found with love. Love is finally an intuition. Just as the knowledge which I have of myself is direct, so 'when B loves C, he feels that he is connected with him by a bond of peculiar strength and intimacy — a bond stronger and more intimate than any other by which two selves can be joined'.<sup>3</sup> 'There are times when the intimacy of the relation of love is felt to be scarcely less than the intimacy of a

<sup>1</sup> NE. para. 381.

<sup>2</sup> NE. para. 459.

<sup>3</sup> NE. para. 464.



man's relation with his own self'.<sup>1</sup> Thus love is an emotion which springs from a sense of union with another self.

This view of McTaggart's is very different from the view commonly held. We generally say we love a person for a certain quality in his character. McTaggart admits that qualities in the beloved may cause the love, but the love is not in respect of that quality. If they cease to have the quality because of which we loved them first, and we cease to love them, we usually hold that love has failed. Thus 'if a man whom I have come to love because I believe him to be virtuous or brave becomes vicious or cowardly, it may make me miserable. It may make me judge him to be evil. But that I should be miserable, or that he should be evil is irrelevant to my love.'<sup>2</sup> The father in the parable of the Prodigal Son still loved his son even when he was evil.

This spontaneous love is the binding force of the universe. Only by means of love can the selves truly know each other, and it is this fact that makes the universe harmonious. It is true that we do not see it at the moment as entirely harmonious, but in the final stage we shall see it as such. When we shall perceive each other in the final stage we shall love every self we perceive, though we shall not necessarily perceive every other self. But as it has been pointed out by Professor Laird in a review in *Mind*, we have no evidence that perception necessarily implies love.

McTaggart will not accept God, and so we are left with this community of selves without God, the college without the Master. This group of selves passes through many stages in the timeless series (the C. series), but the end of the whole process is love. This end is good, for, says McTaggart, 'we know that it is a timeless and endless state of love — love so direct, so intimate and so powerful that even the deepest mystic rapture gives us but the slightest foretaste of its perfection. We know that we shall know nothing but our beloved, and those they love, and ourselves as loving them, and only in this shall we seek and find satisfaction'.<sup>3</sup> As we read about the various stages through which the selves pass, we are reminded of the words of a popular song:—

For your friends are my friends,  
And my friends are your friends.

The more we are together, the merrier we shall be.

Yet in McTaggart's philosophy we have a very lofty conception of selfhood and love. Towards this end of perfect love the whole universe groans and travails. But the system has some difficulties and it lacks the unity which is afforded by the conception of one supreme God, who knows and perfectly loves every self, and is in turn known and loved by every self. McTaggart's system does give us a communion of saints, but instead of standing around the throne of God to sing their Hallelujahs, they simply join hands in eternity to sing 'Auld lang syne'.

# II

If we are to consider the 'agapè' of man to man in Nygren's exposition, we must first consider the Agape of God, for God is the source of all Agape. Nygren puts forward four essential points about the Agape of God.

<sup>1</sup> N.E. para. 464.

<sup>2</sup> NE. para 468.

<sup>3</sup> NE. para. 913.

(i) Agape is spontaneous and uncaused. In this respect it is like the love described by McTaggart. It is vain to look for a cause of the love in the worthiness of the beloved, for we sometimes love the unworthy and God always does so.

(ii) Agape is indifferent to human merit. This is implied in what is said above. This is also true of McTaggart's love, as we have already noted.

(iii) Agape is creative. Nygren elucidates this by saying that it is Agape that confers on man otherwise valueless a new value — the value which comes by reason of his being loved by God. Here there is a vital difference in the thought of Nygren and McTaggart, which will be discussed later.

(iv) Agape opens the way of fellowship with God. This aspect, too, does not concern a philosopher who denies God.

Nygren supports each of these points by reference to the parables of Jesus and the teaching of Paul.

Now in response to this Agape of God man in turn loves God. But this is not Agape for it is not spontaneous and uncaused, being called out by the love of God. It is true that we are told to love God with our whole being, but Nygren says that this love is not more than the acknowledgment of God's absolute supremacy and sovereignty. This difficulty is not found in the synoptic Gospels, but Paul very seldom speaks of the love of man to God as Agape. Paul rather speaks of the Faith of man in God. This, Nygren claims, is a legitimate development from the Gospel usage.

What, then, of the love of man to man? Is this Agape? Paul has no hesitation about speaking of the love of man to man as Agape. And if Nygren's interpretation be correct, then in many respects the Agape of man to man is like the divine Agape. 'It, too, is spontaneous and "uncaused"; it is not called out by the attractiveness of the human being who is its object, but it acts with creative power to bring into being a new fellowship between men.'<sup>1</sup> If that were all that was to be said of the human Agape, then there would be little to distinguish it from McTaggart's love. But there is more to be said. Human Agape is never really spontaneous and uncaused, for in the last resort it is just a reflection of God's Agape. 'The real meaning of Christian love only emerges when it is seen to be dependent on God's love poured out on man.'<sup>2</sup> Here is the root of all human Agape. When a Christian loves his neighbour, it is the love of God (or Christ) working through him. So Paul speaks of 'the love of Christ constraining us'. Further he says, 'I live; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me'. God's Agape is 'shed abroad in our hearts through the Holy Ghost which was given unto us'.

Thus, if this interpretation be correct, there is only one Agape. God loves us, and that same love flows through our lives into the world.

The final touch is added to the N.T. doctrine of Agape by John, who tells us that God is Agape, and Agape is God. It is Agape that binds 'the brethren' into one, though as Nygren remarks, in making Agape apply to the 'brethren' and not to all men, it loses its 'uncausedness' to a certain extent. True Agape is love to all men willy-nilly.

### III

Having set the two conceptions of love side by side we may now compare

<sup>1</sup> A & E. p. 68.

<sup>2</sup> A & E. p. 69.

and contrast them. We have noted the great point of contact between the two ideas already. Love is uncaused. Its root is not to be found in the object loved. It is spontaneous. Further Paul tells us that knowledge without love is of no value. McTaggart asserts that in all relations with the outside world (i.e. perceptions) love is fundamental. Knowledge is imperfect, says Paul, but love is imperishable. Our present knowledge is only appearance, says McTaggart, but love is an eternal relationship which will supersede knowledge.

Humanly speaking, Nygren's love is spontaneous and uncaused, but ultimately it is caused by the Love of God. But McTaggart's love is absolutely uncaused. Hocking tells us in *Living Religions and a World Faith* that 'Love between human beings . . . is no point-blank attraction: it is always by way of third objects, the common End. Subconsciously or unconsciously to love one another is to be drawn to a god.' Now even if love is a point-blank attraction, if it remains only that, then it becomes a selfish love, which is the negation of the higher conception that McTaggart has. Speaking of married love, A. D. Lindsay says in *The Moral Teaching of Jesus*: 'Once mutual love occupies itself with itself, it almost inevitably becomes a common selfishness, when all that makes true love worth while is gone and love in any form is not likely to last.' The danger in McTaggart's system is just that — that 'mutual love occupies itself with itself'. It is only when two persons who are bound by mutual love lose themselves in a common task that they are truly bound to each other. This is illustrated in the principle of the family. It seems necessary that love should go out to something beyond oneself. It is true that in one sense any other self is 'beyond' one's own self, but fundamentally all other selves are just equal members of this democracy of selves. Love seems to demand, whether God exists or not, that the selves should lose themselves not just in each other, but in some overwhelming common loyalty. Now for Nygren the selves are bound to each other by Agape, and on the other hand bound to God by His Agape and their own responding faith. God is the one overwhelming loyalty.

Human Agape for Nygren is explainable by reference to God's Agape. McTaggart can go no further than saying that the existence of the selves and the love that binds them together is a fundamental fact of the universe, beyond which there is no reference. McTaggart's harmonious system is accounted for by nothing and accounts for everything. When we ask how the harmonious system comes about, McTaggart says we may just as well ask who made God and who ascertained that he should be good rather than bad. Now we cannot here go into the problems raised by McTaggart's pluralism, but he does hold diversity to be fundamental to the universe. At the same time he allows that there is a mystic unity in the universe. This unity, as he says in an article on 'Mysticism',<sup>1</sup> may be regarded as omnipresent and all-pervading, or else it may be regarded as only one aspect of the universe, and as combined with diversity. This latter is McTaggart's own position. He says that it may be, as Hegel suggests, that the unity of the whole varies in proportion to the diversity of the parts. We may take the well-known comparison of the human body and the heap of stones. The diversity of the parts of the human body is much more marked than the diversity in the heap of stones, yet the unity of the human body is infinitely greater than that in the heap of stones. But McTaggart

<sup>1</sup> Reprinted in McTaggart's *Philosophical Studies*, published posthumously.

does not draw the further conclusion that where we find the greatest unity we find that there is centrality of control. If we ask ourselves which is the more satisfactory explanation of the community of selves bound by love, a controlling God or a democracy of selves, it is clear that a controlling God gives a universe with a more complete unity. McTaggart would probably admit this, but the difficulty he finds is that the facts of the universe do not warrant the positing of such a complete unity. But the Christian would claim the right to posit such a complete unity by an act of faith.

One of the difficulties in McTaggart's view, and one which must be faced by any Christian view, is raised by A. E. Taylor in *The Faith of a Moralist*. He speaks of the timeless perfection of the selves when they are bound together eternally by perfect love and he adds: 'Whatever it means, it seems to be deprived of genuine moral significance by the consideration that, according to the system, it is something fated to happen to us, not something to be won by personal effort. Apparently we have it thrust upon us, whether we will or no, as Malvolio's greatness was thrust upon him.'<sup>1</sup> Yet even though every self is fated to find a place in the eternal community, there are many stages through which the selves pass, and surely morality has its place in the acceleration of this process. The Christian view has the same difficulty. Either some souls are lost or there is universal salvation. If some souls are lost then surely it must be held that God's Agape has failed, because something, which received its value from the fact of its being loved by God, has been lost. If there is universal salvation then we can say with Taylor, Where is the morality? If it is through morality that we come to a greater realization of our place in the family of God (or McTaggart's community of selves), then it cannot be said that morality has no place in the system. This is not to say that we enter the family of God or McTaggart's community of selves by our own efforts. For the Christian it is an act of grace; for McTaggart it is Fate or Fact.

Professor Basil Williams tells of one occasion when McTaggart had sat silent through an evening's discussion, then at the end he finally said, 'The longer I live, the more I am convinced of the reality of three things, truth, love and immortality.'<sup>2</sup> In this statement is the kernel of McTaggart's philosophy or what we might call his religious faith. Side by side with this we may set Paul's words: 'Faith, Hope, Love; these three, but the greatest of these is Love.' Is this close parallel an accident, or does McTaggart's viewpoint, atheistic though it be, cast new light on the fundamentals of the Christian Faith? We have argued above that McTaggart's system needs God for its completion and explanation. Given McTaggart's system with God we have an excellent exposition of the Communion of Saints. The love which McTaggart describes is very close to the human Agape described by Nygren, but we need God as the source and fountain of that world-binding love.

BERNARD E. JONES

<sup>1</sup> Vol. 1, p. 321.

<sup>2</sup> Dickinson, J. *McT. E. McTaggart*, p. 77.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

- |        |            |                                       |
|--------|------------|---------------------------------------|
| A & E. | Nygren.    | <i>Agape and Eros.</i>                |
|        | McTaggart. | <i>Some Dogmas of Religion.</i>       |
|        |            | <i>Studies in Hegelian Cosmology.</i> |
| NE.    |            | <i>Nature of Existence.</i>           |
|        |            | <i>Philosophical Studies.</i>         |

## CATHERINE BOOTH'S CONVERSION: A CENTENARY TRIBUTE

A DOCTOR friend of mine, deeply interested in psycho-somatic relationships, has a stimulating point of view about Faith. Fear has definite bodily symptoms. One *knows* when one is afraid: an adrenalin reaction puts the body in a state of tension. Similarly one should *know* when one's state of mind is of the reverse order. 'Faith' has bodily reactions: a sense of peace and well-being should be felt in moments of living faith.

This enquiry opens up an interesting field in connection with the Methodist doctrine of Assurance. The forgiveness of sins, when it is received in this fashion, becomes something definite, known — experienced. 'The spirit witnesseth with our spirit that we are sons of God'. The indubitable way of knowledge for most of us is through conscious bodily experience. From the higher realm the experience reverberates through all the channels of our being and becomes known in a definite bodily state. It would be a fascinating study to go through all the classic stories of conversion with this clue in mind.

It is quite certain that something after this order happened in the life of an adolescent girl just one hundred years ago. For ever after she could appeal to that experience and could recommend it to others. She could now speak of God's Forgiveness and God's Love with the ring of certainty. This girl was a keen Methodist, and studies in the literature of her Church led her to believe that there was something lacking in her own religion. It was this very note of certainty, this gift of 'assurance'. 'It seemed to me unreasonable to suppose I could be saved, and yet not know it,' she said. She gave herself a very bad time until the answering flash came, the bodily illumination, the 'witness of the spirit'. One morning as she opened her hymnbook her eyes were caught by the words

My God I am Thine!

What a comfort Divine!

What a blessing to know that my Jesus is mine!

Those words read so often before, suddenly leapt alive. She *knew* now that for which she had been longing. A sense of peace seemed to flood her soul. 'She knew in her body that she was healed.'

This is the event that will be publicly celebrated throughout the world in 1945. Why should it be considered important that this sixteen-year-old girl should *know* her sins forgiven? Because it was a crucial experience in the story of the future wife of General Booth, and because their work together was to be based on this very certainty of salvation. Just as Wesley in his day discovered through personal experience the liberating message of 'assurance', so one hundred years ago this converting experience came to Catherine Mumford and caused her in turn to carry to the masses the essential Methodist message.

The relations between the Booths and contemporary Methodism unfortunately do not redound to the credit of the Church not only of their choice but also of their love. Both of them were passionately devoted to her. William Booth could say later, 'I worshipped everything that bore the name of Methodist'. Their zeal was the cause of the trouble; it created enemies for them. It was a rebuke to the tepid insincerities of others. The occasion of the Reform



Controversy caused their expulsion from Wesleyan Methodism each in turn, because of suspected sympathies with the Reformers. A little later, the Conferences of both Wesleyan and Primitive Methodism were to pass resolutions closing their pulpits to the Booths. And for all this, still later, there were to be made handsome amends.

Within the ranks of the Reformers, these two came to know one another. William was now one of their ministers, receiving a salary of £50 a year. Mrs. Booth's eldest daughter has recently told how her mother at this time refused many offers of marriage, including one from a rich man. These were days when Catherine was suffering much from spinal trouble. Mrs. Mumford pressed her to accept the rich man's offer. He would be able to provide for her comfort. The penniless preacher, however, was chosen, and to her mother's pleadings Catherine rejoined, 'God is there, and He will not forsake those who put their trust in Him.'

It was as well that Catherine entered upon her marriage in that spirit, for later she was to encourage her husband to take several radical steps with nothing apparently but 'the foe behind, the deep before'. It was she whose voice rang out the 'Never' that was to terminate William Booth's ministry with the Methodist New Connexion. It was she who kept him to that decision when it meant a future without definite prospects. It was she who encouraged him to start work outside the Churches, in days when such ventures were rare; and to see all these undertakings through when he himself felt doubtful about their wisdom and their possibility. Later no one could be more daring than William Booth, but a careful reading of their lives leads one to see how much he gained this spirit from her in the beginning.

William Booth married a woman who was matched to him. She brought not only this spirit of enterprise, action and daring faith to their union, but also a trained mind, a keen, logical intellect, and a background of culture that William Booth largely lacked.

Their love-letters make interesting reading, 'No, there is no fear of us loving each other *too much*,' writes Catherine to her future husband in 1855. 'How can we love each other more than Christ has loved us? — and this is the standard He has given. Indeed, this love will only make us more lovable in His sight! What a precious thing is this religion of Jesus! It makes our first duties our highest happiness! It has the promise of the life that now *is*, as well as that which is to come. We will spend all our energies in trying to persuade other men and women to receive and practise it.'

There is more than a hint in these letters, too, of a matter that was to prove very important: Catherine's conception of the status of women. She was convinced of their intellectual possibilities and was more than dissatisfied with the position accorded them in the Christian Church. She made it quite clear that she would never marry anyone who was not prepared to give woman her due. Little did she or her future husband realize how large a part they were destined to play in the story of the emancipation of women. The use that was made of feminine leadership in the Christian Mission and the Salvation Army had repercussions far outside the religious field, and without doubt affected popular feeling about woman's share in public life.

1855 was the year of their marriage. The honeymoon proved characteristic



of the life that was to follow. After a few days in Ryde, they crossed to Guernsey, where meetings had been arranged, and soon the honeymooners were in the midst of a revival! William Booth, by this time, was a minister of the Methodist New Connexion; but difficulties soon began to accumulate for him within this branch of Methodism. At the beginning his gifts as an evangelist were readily accepted. Then in 1857 Conference stopped his evangelistic tours, and he was appointed to a circuit at Brighthouse, and then in 1859, to Gateshead. In this Tyneside town the story of Mrs. Booth's own work begins to be recorded. She was asked by a unanimous invitation of the Leaders' Meeting to address a big gathering. 'Of course, I declined,' she says. 'I don't know what they can be thinking of.' She had, however, on her own initiative, started a system of house-to-house visitation, and had gathered ten ex-drunkards into a regular weekly meeting.

This stay in Gateshead was an important one in the story of Catherine Booth. Events took a course scarcely anticipated. A neighbouring minister published a pamphlet arguing, on Scriptural grounds, that women had no right to preach. An American Evangelist and his wife, who were holding meetings in Newcastle, had called forth this diatribe. To this Mrs. Booth replied with her pamphlet on 'Female Ministry' — her husband helping her in correcting the proofs and seeing it through the press. In spite of her advocacy of 'Female Ministry' she herself still held back from public speaking.

Bethesda Chapel in Gateshead where the Booths ministered is now a printing works. Now, where a thousand people used to assemble to hear William Booth and to discuss his novel methods of evangelism, one stands among the noise of machinery and the smell of printers' ink. It is not altogether fanciful, however, to imagine above the noise of the presses one can hear the faint echoes of a woman's voice raised in that Church for the first time. At a service on a certain memorable Sunday, some friends of William Booth's were taking part. Many were speaking freely out of their own experience of spiritual things. No one could have any idea of what was going on in the mind of the minister's wife in the back pew. A voice within was telling her that she should take part in this service, and say something for God, then and there, in public. At the same time, she was remembering how, during an illness a little while before, she had promised she would be obedient to any command that came from God. In spite of all this, she felt unable to move. Then a voice said, 'Besides you are not prepared, you will look a fool, and have nothing to say.' It was that word that settled it, said Mrs. Booth. 'That is just the point. I have never yet been willing to be a fool for Christ, now I will be one,' and without stopping for another moment she rose up and walked down the chapel. Before her non-plussed husband and that large congregation she spoke, telling them how she had been holding back from this very thing and being disobedient to God. Those who were present were deeply stirred, and William, being the kind of man he was, boldly announced that his wife would be preaching at the service that evening! It was the start of a remarkable ministry. While she was well enough to stand and speak, Mrs. Booth said, she was never allowed to have another quiet Sunday.

Let those who have an eye for these things never forget the cost of this ministry. While conducting meetings, helping in the organization of the Chris-

tian Mission and the Army, Mrs. Booth brought up a family of eight children with exemplary skill and wisdom. Money was often short, and there were dinners to cook, garments to mend, and household tasks to be done. 'I cannot give the time to preparation unless I can afford to put my sewing out,' writes this woman, who is both a woman of affairs and a woman of the home.

That speech at Gateshead marked a second turning-point in the story of Catherine Booth. Hitherto, she had been reserved and shy in public. From henceforward those would be the last adjectives that people would think of using about her. As we have said, it was her 'Never' that so undid from the gallery of the Methodist New Connexion Conference in 1861, when the Conference was trying once more to deny her husband the work of a travelling Evangelist. After they had taken this risk, leaving the Connexion without financial aid or prospects, bolder ideas than ever came to them. Eighteen months of continuous revival meetings followed in Cornwall, and then they went to Cardiff, and, in their endeavour to reach the largest number of people, they used the large circus building there. The Wesleyan and Primitive Methodist Conferences helped to force this kind of decision on them by their resolutions in 1862 forbidding the Booths from their pulpits.

At Walsall in 1863 we find that a march through the streets is being organized and that Mrs. Booth is venturing into open-air work. Much use begins to be made of converted working-men to talk to their fellows. At a monster camp meeting at Hatherton Lake, converted prize-fighters, drunkards, gamblers, speak with great effect.

'We can't get at the masses in the chapels,' Mrs. Booth writes to her mother in 1864. Their convictions are forming that something new and unconventional is needed, different to and independent of existing movements. Then, opportunity for work of this very kind opens in London, when William Booth starts his meetings on the Quaker Burial-ground in Whitechapel. This work develops into the 'Christian Mission', during a period when Mrs. Booth is holding meetings in Ramsgate, Margate, Croydon, Edinburgh and at the Dome in Brighton. It helps one to understand the power of her ministry to know that on one occasion a deputation waited on her with the offer to build her a church larger than Spurgeon's Tabernacle. The eagle, however, would not be chained.

Another stage in the developing story is reached in 1874, when the annual Conference of Mission workers is held. The Conference is based on the Methodist model, but an innovation is that women are admitted as representatives. Meanwhile the Mission is extending. Practical experience convinces the Booths of the need for a less democratic constitution, and in 1877 a system unconsciously resembling a military organization is adopted. Later on in the same year the inspiration comes to call their movement, 'The Salvation Army'.

This Army was designed to bring the knowledge of Salvation to the masses, to persuade them to accept it, and to follow on to a dedicated life of 'Holiness'. In the earliest days, the marches and demonstrations of the Army called forth a storm of abuse and persecution strangely reminiscent of that which greeted the Early Methodists. 'Take no notice of them! March straight on!' were the General's orders to his soldiers in all these ordeals.

The coming years were to see the enormous success of their methods, and the

spread of the Army not only throughout this country but into America, Australia, India, Sweden, Canada and France.

In 1879 a Council of War was held in the Newcastle and Gateshead district. Eighteen years before, the Booths had left this area under the cloud of resignation from the New Connexion. They returned to a very different situation. Six girl officers of their Army had been working in the two towns: hundreds of roughs had been converted, and nine thousand people were attending the Army's meetings.

So much had the situation changed since their struggle against official opposition and public persecution that, in the following year, William Booth was asked to address the Wesleyan Conference. Let his wife speak of her impressions of this event: 'Yesterday was a wonderful day in our history. My dearest addressed the Wesleyan Conference! I cannot tell you all about it, till we meet, but it looks like a miracle! He was most respectfully and kindly received and listened to, and several of the lay nabobs congratulated him afterwards most enthusiastically.'

Methodism can still afford to listen to the message of the Booths. Their concern for the deepest needs of men should recall us to our commission as a Church. 'Christianity is necessarily aggressive,' said Mrs. Booth on one occasion. 'It cannot be Christianity which is not aggressive. The true light cannot be hid; it cannot shine for itself; it must go out, and out, and out to the uttermost part of the earth, and go on and on to the end of time.' Notes dear to the heart of John Wesley are struck again and again in her teaching. The fact of Assurance — the fact that made such a difference to Mrs. Booth herself one hundred years ago — is always being stressed. The life of Obedience, and the possibility of living in Perfect Love, or 'Holiness' as Salvation Army circles have always preferred to call it, are constantly reiterated.

The last time that she spoke in London was after she had received sentence of death from the doctors who had diagnosed her illness as cancer. Brave woman that she was, she preached as though she had all life before her, but as though her hearers must decide on the matters she was raising then and there. She was preaching by invitation of Dr. Parker at the City Temple. She returned to the theme which should be in our minds at this Centenary: the need for definite certainty of one's forgiveness by God. She said, 'I have been appalled and amazed at the comparatively few out of the hundreds with whom I have conversed, who have understood that the realization of the forgiveness of sins is possible, and I have been appalled at the comparatively few professing Christians who enjoy this blessing. They do not appear to know that it is for them, and that Jesus Christ is a positive, present Saviour.'

In that same sermon, she said, 'A gospel of love never matched anybody's soul. The great want in this day is *truth that cuts*; convicting truth; truth that convicts and convinces the sinner and pulls off the bandages from his eyes.' Students of Mrs. Booth's will know that the last phrase is a typical one, often recurring. She was always anxious that the bandages should be torn from people's eyes. Hers was no sentimental message. It was incisive and prophetic, closely reasoned. It still possesses the ability to offend those who prefer smooth words and an easy message.

On her death-bed, she was often thought dying and rallied again. There was

much singing and much praying there. One of the hymns that was sung was the hymn that had such an influence on her in 1845:

My God, I am Thine!  
What a comfort Divine!

What a blessing to know that my Jesus is mine!

This humble-minded persistent little woman died, universally mourned. 'She lived for the likes o' me,' cried one poor girl, who passed before her coffin with the thousands of others. The girl's hair was dishevelled, her hat was torn, and her boots were tied together with string. She spoke for the masses and for the 'submerged tenth', who had always been the concern of Catherine as well as of William Booth. Catherine Booth would have been pleased at the 'Commando' development in modern Methodism. How strange it is that once more we are using the military metaphor! She would remind us that none of us — including the members of her own movement — must get into a rut. Our gospel is always the same, but our methods are and must be adaptable: this was her constant theme. She found many of the methods which the Army adopted quite foreign to her own tastes and disposition, but that mattered not at all. She was prepared for the sake of the Kingdom, and for the sake of the millions living in bitter need, to forsake her own preferences, and to work in any way that was effective.

It was a great discovery that adolescent girl made one hundred years ago. It puts us in mind of other words better known to Methodists . . . 'I felt my heart strangely warmed. I felt I did trust in Christ, Christ alone, for salvation; and an assurance was given me, that he had taken away *my* sins, even *mine*, and saved *me* from the law of sin and death.' It is a right instinct that has made Methodists look back to the Aldersgate Street experience as the crucial point in the story of Wesley and the beginning of Methodism. It is the same instinct that is leading to the celebration of the year 1845 in connection with Catherine Booth and the Salvation Army. The thing that modern Methodism needs as much as anything else is a recovery of all that lies behind this certainty of assurance: a change that is *known*: a belief that is *certain* in a Saviour who can do all that He has promised. So certain is this fact that its results can be felt. To the questing soul Faith brings an answer that reaches deep down into the whole of one's being. Things begin to happen when Christians look for an experience as definite as this, and can tell others of it.

CYRIL H. POWELL

### A FAMILY OF NATIONS: THE CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE OF SOCIETY

THE purpose of this article may be briefly stated. It is to show the reality, and the special relevance to the world of to-day, of the Christian message of the Family. The word 'family' is here used as the exact correlative of the 'Our Father' of the Lord's Prayer and its New Testament context. It is not to be confused with the domestic family. Nor is the name 'Father' restricted

to the relations of the Holy Trinity, as in the historic creeds. He is 'Our Father'; we are His family.

It is a message of relationships, embracing the whole collective life of man. It is no abstraction of human thought, but a vital principle integrating man's earthly life. Rooted in the Father; revealed in the Son; imparted by the Spirit; it waits to be recognized, received and realized by the human family of God. This is the creative purpose of God, and the true destiny of man. The very tissue of human relationship, it is consistent throughout, from the smallest local community to a Family of Nations.

The phrase 'family of nations' is coming into common use. With increasing frequency, and with varying values, it falls from the lips of statesmen and religious leaders. We read it almost daily in the press. The Prime Minister, reporting upon a recent Conference of the Allied Powers, expresses the hope that 'a family of democratic nations' will emerge from the war. From America comes the definite suggestion that 'a family of nations be formed to keep the peace of the world'. In all this there is both hope and danger. Hope, because it indicates clearly the direction in which the nations are feeling after the truth that will unite them. Danger, lest they be satisfied with another phrase, or vainly imagine once more that *impersonal* truth can become their common bond. A phrase will not suffice; nor does moral truth dwell in propositions; it lives in persons, divine and human, and nowhere else. It is revealed and received through personal relationships. A family implies fatherhood, and a 'Family of Nations' without the Fatherhood of God means nothing at all; it becomes an empty phrase. For the life of mankind is morally and spiritually rooted in the God whose 'offspring' he is, 'in Whom he lives, and moves and has his being', and 'who has made of one blood all nations to dwell together'.<sup>1</sup>

Another phrase in even more common use in certain circles is 'personality in community'. With due respect to the eminent men who make much use of it, this is pure abstraction; it is an abstraction within an abstraction. The phrase is true enough in philosophic thought, as the symbols of a correct equation are true in mathematics. And that is precisely how it is being used. But it is not concrete; it is not *real*; and it is not 'understood of the people'. It was recently quoted, for a test, as a favourite phrase of a revered leader, in a middle class home (the father is a Doctor of Science). Promptly one member in the early twenties demanded 'What the h — does he mean?' 'Oh,' replied the first speaker, 'he means a child in a family.' 'Then why the d — doesn't he say so?' This article is an attempt to say so.

The League of Nations failed because it *was* a league, and nothing more. It will fail again if it remains nothing more. The very word 'League' is totally inadequate for such high enterprise. It is a hollow term, without moral content. It may serve to link together a limited number of football teams, or an assortment of thieves; it will never serve to unite men and nations in the fullness of their life. Such unity will demand that the bond be consistent with the true nature of the constituent members; it must be deeply human. It must, for that very reason, also be divine. 'League' fails just here. It is completely inadequate to the real nature of man, while it ignores altogether his relation to

<sup>1</sup> Acts xvii. 26, 28.



God. To take, for the moment, but one aspect; it leaves out the emotional nature of man, and in doing so, ignores 'the better part of him'. Dr. Fosdick tells us that 'religion is two-thirds emotion'. He might with perfect confidence extend this proportion to the whole of life. This emotional life unheeded and unharnessed by the 'League' escapes and runs wild. Hitler, capturing the unharnessed steed yokes it to the chariot of hell. The *causes* of war may be deep and not easy to be discerned; the *occasion* of war is often clear. Quite plainly Hitler's war of aggression has been run on the emotional life of German youth with the general consent of the German people. Cold, rational, political leagues could be laughed at, agreements torn up, by such demonic force. What could *not* be laughed at was the awakening and uprising of another emotion — the emotion of a free people, who loving freedom far more than life itself, rose up as one united family in defence of hearth and home.

Wars are waged on emotion. No statesman or national leader can dispense with it, or will it otherwise. The task of the future is to enlist in the enterprises of peace those emotions hitherto enlisted to wage war. So long as statesmen and politicians persist in ignoring — even despising — the emotional, or non-rational, elements in human nature they will find themselves frustrated and defeated. They are pitting themselves against the true nature of man, and against the God who created him. This issue cannot be evaded. It is the real battle, and they are on the losing side. Man is both rational and emotional, and to ignore either is fatal to both. God is a Father and His heart is set on a family; He is not to be put off with anything less. No 'City of Foundations' can be built of political abstractions; such an erection will go down like a house of cards, before an uprising of the human spirit. 'God is love', and He made man in His own image.

Untrue to the real nature of man, the League is equally untrue to the character of God, whom, in fact, it ignores. Let the high courage and idealism of man's greatest endeavour expressed in the League, be freely admitted; yet the League is best described as the last and widest rationality of political optimism, having its roots in humanism. In other words, it is a human contrivance. It marks the end of an age.

What then was the Church doing to accept almost unanimously and without constructive criticism, so grievous an outrage of human nature, and such an ignoring of God? She was simply following her custom — at least in recent times — of adopting the offspring of pagan political thought, instead of bringing to birth the children of her own true life. She has in turn examined every political 'ism' as it arose outside her own borders. Incidentally she has passed judgment upon it and divided her ranks in the process. Conservatism, Liberalism, Socialism, Communism, in turn, have all left their scars upon her already divided life. All the time her own authentic message, implicit in her very life, waited its unfolding. The word in its widest, deepest meaning is her very own. It is the one word in human language that is at once consistent with the true nature of man and the character of God. It is the word **FAMILY**. Not for one moment must this word be confined to the domestic family of man's earthly mating. That has its place — a sacred place — in the whole building, but it is *not* the building. It is not even the foundation; it is an illustration. The foundation is found, and must be found, where the penetrating

mind of St. Paul found it: 'for this cause I bow my knees unto the Father, from whom every family in heaven and on earth is named'.<sup>1</sup>

For nearly two thousand years the Church has taught men everywhere to look up and pray 'Our Father'; she has *not* taught them to look around and say 'Our Family'.<sup>2</sup> This great neglected co-relative of 'Our Father' waits for its unfolding. And the time for that unfolding is now. What may have been difficult, impracticable, even impossible in days of Roman rule, in feudal times, and later in the throes of industrial revolution, is the very word of Life for this age of the common man. For him the goal is one great family.

There are some who deny the universal Fatherhood of God, but their objections cannot stand. If voluntary, vital creation of a being in His own likeness is not Fatherhood what is? Surely such creation is more fully fatherhood than the physical agency of one parent in pro-creation. The prototype of parenthood is God not man.

The earnest evangelical Christian may protest, on the basis of his personal experience. He knows he is a child of God; he is conscious of having been 'born again'. Exactly: 'twice-born'. His experience is a great trust. But let him not deny the heritage of the 'once-born'.<sup>3</sup> It is the foundation of man's natural life, without which the witness of the 'twice-born' would be irrelevant and in vain.

The theologian may protest, for the sake of his system of thought. 'Surely', he says, 'if there is Fatherhood there must be conscious and responsive sonship. Can sonship be either unconscious or unresponsive?' It can be both. The newborn infant, placed in the hands of a fond young father, is completely unconscious of a very real fatherhood. Does it not appear that as in the individual, so in the race, there is in infancy a period of growing consciousness? God's Fatherhood does not grow; He is 'The Father Everlasting'.<sup>4</sup> Our sonship grows, in response to the revelation of the Fatherhood, until we come to the full consciousness of the 'twice-born' in Christ. The unresponsive son, who by his disobedience has brought dishonour on the family name, may remove himself to a distance and refuse to return. He does not cease to be a son, and is still greatly loved. The purpose of the Parable of the Prodigal Son was to reveal God as the Father of both the reprobate and the respectable. It was addressed to the respectable and to their contempt of the reprobate.

Others even apologize for the name 'Father' in some such phrase as, 'for want of a better word'. Yet they never think of apologizing for 'Sovereignty',

<sup>1</sup> Ephesians iii. 14-15.

<sup>2</sup> The Brotherhood Movement cannot be considered an exception, though it calls for notice. It was a feeler rather than a finder. Its limitations are obvious: (1) a lack of depth, with an easy acceptance of brotherhood without an adequate conception of Fatherhood; (2) a restriction to one sex, and that at mature age. The Sisterhood Movement supplemented, without correcting it; it added one sectional movement to another. It failed of the rich and inclusive conception of the Family, embracing both sexes, all ages and all nations.

The watch-words of the French Revolution—Liberty, Equality, Fraternity—became barren political abstractions for the sufficient reason that 'Fraternity' was without Paternity, which is absurd. For France it proved fatal.

<sup>3</sup> 'Twice-born' and 'once-born' are not used as William James (in *Varieties of Religious Experience*) uses them, of two types of Christian; still less of the 'morbid' and the 'healthy-minded'. They are used in the plain sense of the New Testament: 'Ye must be born again' or 'from above' (John iii. 7). Clearly here and elsewhere a second birth is implied. Whether the process be sudden or gradual is unimportant; the experience of conscious sonship marks the 'twice-born' man of New Testament Christianity.

<sup>4</sup> The Te Deum.

'Ruler', 'Judge', all of which are human words. Jesus preferred 'Father' before them all, and invariably used it. And in using it He transformed it. The word, of human origin (as it needs must be), receives a content of divine origin. All that is positive, constructive, and strong in human fatherhood is carried to infinity in the Fatherhood of God; while all that is negative, sentimental and weak, is entirely absent. Jesus transformed our word 'love' so that without apology and with the deepest reverence we say 'God is Love'. With equal reverence we say 'God is Father'. How akin they are! 'God is love' *because* God is Father.

There is a natural man, and there is a spiritual man — the once-born and the twice-born sons of God. They share the same earth, they breathe the same air, they plough the same soil, they reap the same crops. This contact of the 'twice-born' with the 'once-born' sons is vital. God has ordained it. Jesus accepted it. His prayer confirmed it for His followers: 'Not that Thou wilt take them out of the world, but that Thou wilt keep them from the evil one.'<sup>1</sup> Jesus, 'Strong Son of God' sure in His perfect Sonship, moved easily among both — more easily, in fact among the 'once-born' publicans and sinners than the devout persons approved. He loved them, shared their homes, shared their meals — was called their *Friend*. He was sure of His own relationship. If His followers were more sure, more mature in their sonship, would they not, like their Master, be more at home with their 'once-born' brothers; neither fearing to lose their own experience nor assuming a superior sanctity? There is no more gracious and humbling experience than undertaking for the family. Is it not for this very thing that the followers of Jesus are called to live among their 'once-born' brothers and share with them the Father's gifts? The 'twice-born' son finds his true vocation, his vital witness, in living beside his fellow man in the spirit of the family to the *nth* power. In such living he speaks a universal language, a language more effective than any 'form or sign or ritual word'. By this very spirit he is the 'salt of the earth', 'the light of the world'.<sup>2</sup> Not otherwise is he either.

It is just here, where the two meet on a common earth, and in the common walks of life, where nothing is secular but sin, that the living Church holds the key to all human *problems* because she holds the key to all human *relationships*. It is the master key of life.

This master key will unlock every door of man's communal life: spiritual, social, economic, national and international. The Church is essentially a family of the 'twice-born'; God, in His relatedness is the 'Father of all'.<sup>3</sup> Jesus rejoices in 'bringing many sons into glory'; the whole 'creation waits with eager longing for the sons of God to be revealed'.<sup>4</sup> Man's social life is possessed and hallowed by the spirit of the family; his economic life becomes sacramental of a Father's gifts to His children's material needs; his national life a distinctive world service; his international life a Family of Nations dwelling together in a Father's house and developing the resources of the earth on which He has placed them in justice, brotherhood and peace.

Impossible? The very nature of man demands it. God wills it; it is His creative purpose. The world waits for it. 'Impossible' is the word of the 'once-born' who has defiled his heritage, and blurred his vision. 'The thing impossible

<sup>1</sup> John xvii. 15 (Moffatt). <sup>2</sup> Matthew v. 13, 14. <sup>3</sup> Ephesians iv. 6. <sup>4</sup> Romans viii. 19 (Moffatt).

shall be' sang the apostles of the Eighteen-Century Revival. However difficult in human estimate; however distant to human eyes, the Living Church can be satisfied with nothing less, and can approve no proximate step that does not lead to this ultimate goal. The burning vision must be ever before her, though she 'seek a holy city beyond the rim of the sky'.

This is not utopian; it is urgent. The distance of the goal is the measure of the urgency, and a reproach to our witness. There is much lee-way to be made up. Change — vast and far-reaching change — is upon us. Mankind is moving definitely, even swiftly, to some form of collective life. Whether that collective life is to find its centre in a political authority imposed from without, or in the free and willing fellowship of a Family of God, is the challenge of to-day to the Christian Church, and not least to her privileged sons.

And it is beyond all things imperative that she should tell men everywhere, in the shortest time, in the simplest language, and in the plainest speech at her command, whither she is leading. Men will hear her. They are ready for her message of a *World Family of Nations*, for their deepest and most conscious need is world unity.

As the brutalized colliers of Kingswood, and the disinherited iron-workers of the black country responded to Wesley's rallying cry: '*I, even I, am a child of God*', so to-day men will answer to the authentic and thrilling Christian word for *this* age: '*We, even we, are a family of God*'. It is the same Gospel, to another age — the age of collective man.

TOM DRING

## CHRISTIAN THINKERS AND THE SUB-CHRISTIAN MIND

THERE appears to be, in these days, a tendency among Christian thinkers toward what may, with reservations, be called the evolutionary view of the Christian faith; based on what Dr. Fort Newton has described as the 'tug-of-war' theory of life. The Dean of Chichester, Dr. Reinhold Niebuhr, Canon Cockin, and the author of *On To Orthodoxy*, D. R. Davies, are all, in their own way, inclined to this view. Their position, to put it roughly and briefly, is that, whatever may be true of heaven, there will never be a state of perfection on earth. Evil, like the poor, will always be with us, and would appear to be, as Canon Cockin has quite definitely hinted, necessary for the achievement of the good. All of us must just go on hoping and expecting that men and the world will gradually get better, though, of course, there is no necessity about it. The revolutionary character of Christianity — that side of the Faith so often overlooked — appears to have been abandoned for an evolutionary conception dependent not on necessity but upon contingency. That, at least, would appear to be the view of Dr. Niebuhr if his position, to be dealt with later, is that everything depends upon whether or not men and nations live in the consciousness of being under the judgment of God.

The problem, of course, is an old one, and it may be that there is no final solution to it. In any case, whether owing to our time of crisis or to a previously

false view of the nature of man and the world, there appears to be no hesitancy now in declaring for imperfect achievement or, as it might be described, a relative salvation in an unideal world. To put it baldly, there is no possible chance of establishing Utopia here on earth, and if there were, we should neither like it nor want it. Actually, by implication, the claim goes beyond this: it assumes the need of hell for the gaining of heaven.

Now all this, if true, is very serious as well as important. Indeed, the question might legitimately be asked whether this special brand of evolutionary view is not, after all, a defeatist view. It may be true that men never reach the ideal and therefore, in that sense, can never gain perfection. It certainly looks as though perfection, if gained at all in this world, can only be gained within the limits of faltering human nature; and if that be true, the question arises whether that which is gained can be called perfection at all. Nevertheless, the burden of those who promulgate this point of view is to relate it to Christ's life and work in God's plan for the world or, if not that, another view of Christ, at variance with the traditional view, must be offered. What is the relation of Christ, and all His coming into the world implies, to the realizability of the Kingdom of God on earth? What is the relation of Christ to the fact of a redeemed world; to the gaining, within the limits of human nature, of perfection; to Christianity as a revolutionary rather than an evolutionary force? Or are these questions, now that so many see the truth to lie in the acceptance of a permanently imperfect world, merely pedantic and without any real substance? A full and complete answer would involve consideration of a Christian view of history and philosophy, together with an exhaustive survey of theology. It is enough here to say that, to the present writer, the acceptance of a view of the world as a permanently imperfect world is, whether intended or not, an accommodation to the sub-Christian mind: it is also, in some measure, a discouraging judgment for those who have confidently gloried in the expectation of the kingdoms of this world becoming the kingdom of Our Lord Jesus Christ. Where is the need for urgency, for effort, for a gospel of Good News, if in the end there is no victory, no overcoming? Does not such a position mean, in actual fact, that we are shut in to making the best of things as they are, or, as the Dean of Chichester once put it — he was addressing a meeting of clergy and ministers — 'I believe, in this wicked, degenerate world, all you can hope to do is to get things done decently. It is impossible to get anything perfect.' Obviously, the sub-Christian mind will have no difficulty about that. But is there any 'gospel' here; anything that makes a radical difference to life? There is certainly nothing dynamic about getting things done decently.

Many people in the churches are burdened with the sense of this world being a sinful world, which, of course, it is. Yet none would regard it as a lost, unsalvable world. And indeed, the question of the salvability of the world is not in dispute. What is in dispute is the degree of salvation possible in the world. Yet it is just here where something of vital importance is apt to be overlooked. Salvation, it is suggested, is a matter of degree; and, it is assumed, it is a matter of degree because the sin of the world is permanent. Man is 'a miserable sinner' in the sense that he has no real worth in him; he can do no good of himself; and only because he stands under the judgment of God can he, when he realizes what that judgment is, have any hope at all. But is not this a too violent swing



of the pendulum? There is a sense in which the phrase 'miserable sinner' is true but not, surely, in this way. What becomes of the view that man is born in the image of God? Or, now that the 'image' is expressed in terms of personality, but without ethical content, can it be safely assumed that 'the spark of Divinity' has no basis of claim? Is man naturally evil or is it more true to say he is naturally good but prone to evil?

The position of Niebuhr is the most challenging. If we understand him correctly, his argument is that the only hope for betterment lies in man having an uneasy conscience, and such a conscience is possible only if he realizes he is under the smarting judgment of God. But is there not a gap here? What if man does not feel he is under the judgment of God? Is it inevitable, in Niebuhr's argument, that he should? Is there a necessity about it? If so, then why not a necessity of the good rather than the permission of evil for the gaining of the good? If there is no necessity, then Niebuhr bases his faith on a contingency. Maybe it is the fact of this contingency that induces him to what can only be described as a despair of the world. Is the truth, the faith, the power, and the extent of Christianity dependent on the contingency of creating conscience-stricken men? Surely this is a philosophy of doom — no hope for the world except in a conscience aroused to a sensibility of the judgment of God — and it appears to be due to a confusion of thought. That men need the quickened conscience no Christian would deny, and some would regard this, as the present writer does, as the supreme task of the Christian Church to create. But does the history of achievement and advance depend solely on conscience-aroused men without whom, it is assumed, there is no hope at all for men or the world? Is there not a natural good in man seeking constantly to work itself out and which, once linked with the Christian faith, gives ground for believing that here in the earth the kingdom of God can be established as a perfect society? And does not the Christian faith demand such a view if its redemptive plan is sufficient for the world? Is Croce so very far wrong in claiming that history is the story of liberty, dependent on the inherent character of life and men? That is, is there not something that men feel themselves impelled to seek for their own and others' good? And is it rational to call this good evil?

The quickened conscience, as we see it, is for the gaining of a clearer knowledge of God and God's way for the world: it is not an indication of the awareness by the possessor that he is by nature totally evil. The man with such a conscience most certainly realizes the enormity of evil both in the world and in his own life, and his dependence upon God. But this does not involve the view that, previous to the light, he was completely without worth and hope. And if, as we believe, there is hope for men in the mass, even if it be the hope of a contingency, the same applies to a man as an individual. If there is something in the world that saves men in the mass from going completely wrong, there is also something in the individual. Why, then, a gospel of despair? There are some things which not even the exceeding sinfulness of man can destroy — truth, goodness, beauty, music, poetry, civilization, art, and, we believe, the Church. There have been occasions when all of them have suffered some deterioration and decay, but they have not died. They belong to the stuff of life, and man has been the recipient of their influence. Why then despair or resort to a contingency as the sole condition of salvation and hope?

In an attempt to arrive at a clear conclusion it is necessary to disentangle the threads of the argument, for it seems to us that the difficulties of the problem have come about because of the failure to be assured of the implications of one theory before proceeding to the next. Let us begin like this: What is the Christian view of history? What is the Christian view of philosophy or, to be more precise, the Christian philosophy of life? What is Christian doctrine as revealed in the theology of the Church? It is of course obviously impossible to provide, within limited space, a complete answer: all we need is a fairly satisfying reply in regard to this ever-persisting problem of the degree and kind of goodness, beauty, and truth that are obtainable in the world as it is. Does a Christian view of history, the Christian philosophy of life, and Christian doctrine involve the acceptance of the view that we cannot gain perfection in an imperfect world? We have argued that Niebuhr links God's plan of salvation and redemption with a contingency — something that may or may not happen. This, if offered as an interpretation of Christian doctrine, is surely quite unwarranted, and would appear to be due to a view of God in history which admits that the entrance of men and nations into evil as, say, in war, is, in given circumstances, part of God's plan for the world. It is this point of view, we imagine, which leads Niebuhr to insist that because there is a perpetual tension in life — Fort Newton's eternal tug-of-war — there is no possible likelihood of knowing on earth who or what is going to be the winner; God or the devil, good or evil. Therefore there can be no Utopia — no satisfying perfection. We must wait for heaven.

Take, for instance, the question of justice. Niebuhr admits that justice only proximates to love yet agrees that love is the *esse* of the Christian faith. But justice is necessary. If, to be properly administered, justice needs force, that is perfectly justifiable from the point of view of Christianity. For power — force — prevents men and nations from slipping into anarchy. Man is not good enough to have a community without also having and, when necessary, using power. Yet power can destroy and will destroy unless used in the interests of justice. The one necessary test for Niebuhr is whether or not men and nations use power in fear and trembling and in the consciousness that they are under the judgment of God. That is the test. And once more we are back to the only ground on which sub-Christian policies can be justified. For, clearly enough, the prospect of men gaining an uneasy conscience rather than being satisfied with a conscience at ease is sheer contingency; unless, of course, there is necessity about it which, if true, destroys the whole argument. It may be the duty of the Church to get men and nations into this condition in order to get the truth of God clear, but there is nothing of a compelling nature about it. It is a sort of take it or leave it business — here is the truth: accept it and all will be well, reject it and go on suffering. But is that all? If nations do not use power in fear and trembling, what then? Does the world collapse, civilization cease, and men become doomed? On Niebuhr's argument, it would appear to be so, and in this sense his gospel is one of doom. Is there nothing that can guarantee life and its continuance as a desirable and future perfect thing apart from the uneasy conscience? Or are we back again at the point where we ask whether there is an inevitability about conscience making men fear and tremble? And if not, what then? For ourselves, we plead for the

quicken conscience but we do not base the fact of purposeful life or its continuance upon it. In short, we do not believe that the right, full, exclusive view of man is found in the phrase, now again very prevalent, 'miserable sinners', particularly if that is all that can be said about his essential nature. Men are sinners, of that there is no doubt. Nevertheless, men are men and that involves more than the fact of being sinners. There are saving as well as sinful agencies in man and not everything has been said about him when he is described as 'a miserable sinner'.

Everywhere, and to all classes, Christian thinkers are admitting that Christianity cannot be fully lived either in the modern world or in any future world. It is impossible, they admit, to get Christ's way of life accepted in its fullness in the earth. Human nature is against it. Regretfully, but quite definitely, so it seems, it must be admitted that Jesus Christ was not a realist after all but rather, like the barbarian and sub-Christian mind has been arguing all along, simply an impossible idealist. 'I cannot live up to Christ's standard', says the barbarian; to which most Christian thinkers of our day are replying, in effect, 'We don't expect you to'. It may be expected that one or two ascetics and mystics will attempt it but it is impossible for the masses. Indeed, it is contrary to the constitution of things. We cannot conceive of this way of life ever being fully established on earth. God intended only that we all should live by approximation to the Christian standard, not according to the standard itself. The standard is just something that urges forward the human spirit, something men can measure themselves against so that stagnation is avoided.

That this attitude has become pleasing to the sub-Christian mind cannot be denied. Many such people have, maybe, looked wistfully at the Christ and also at the life suggested by His truth. In moments of noble desire they may have felt drawn to experience it. But when the actualities of life have presented themselves they have turned away, regretfully and despairingly, realizing their weakness, shame, and cowardice. But *now*, if it be true that loving your neighbour and your enemy is but an ideal — something that cannot be gained in practice by men and nations in the mass — then they do not mind making the experiment. If that is what is meant by being a Christian, they have no objections to attempting it: on these grounds it is a manageable faith. If one is no longer expected to reach the ideal — to turn the other cheek, to forgive one's enemies, to expect heaven on earth — it meets their practical way of life. The other way is all very beautiful, but, of course, neither fits in with the Western mind nor yet is in harmony with the requirements of Western civilization. The age of Jesus Christ, it is pointedly made clear, is not ours and industrialism and a highly mechanized civilization have made a difference. If our modern industrialized civilization has to be fitted into Christianity, the plain, simple fact is — it cannot be done. But if Christianity has to be fitted into our modern system of life so that we make the best of it we can, then there is hope. So the argument goes. 'Fitting Christianity in' is the new-old emphasis.

With this new emphasis — the emphasis of Niebuhrism — the barbarian now admits that Christianity has a place: it now comes within the scope of human achievement. It must, of course, be realized at once that there is nothing here of the redemptive power of the Gospel, the energizing influence of the Holy Spirit, the gaining of the kingdom of God. All these presumably now suffer a

new interpretation. The full purpose of God is seen in man's attempt to proximate to the Divine will. Only in one way does God directly affect man: He has put him under judgment. But again, presumably, he has put him under the judgment of proximities. Or is it that judgment is found in the ideal being put over against the actual? In any case, here is the step by step, the evolutionary, view of redemption and salvation; dependent on the contingency of man possessing an uneasy conscience in the pursuit of a proximate Christianity.

If it be true that familiarity breeds contempt, it is not outside the bounds of possibility that men may so come to accept the proximate as the norm that this, in its turn, becomes, if not theoretically so, the actual ideal. And if it be said that men will never be able to escape the challenge of the ideal, it ought to be made clear why it is so. Is it due to something external to man or to the nature of man? And if it is due to the nature of man — a nature which will not allow him to rest in the actual or proximate — is this something natural or acquired? Has man acquired so much good down the centuries that he is unable to silence the challenge of the ideal, or is it due, in spite of all his sins and failures, to his inherent make-up — the natural good of the heart? To the present writer, it appears to be unmistakably due to a natural disposition toward goodness in man. The failure of men to gain the satisfying perfect — not a proximate, resulting from the belief that the perfect in actual fact cannot be attained — is due to the overlaying of the good by man-made operations of the few and not to the depravity of the many. In brief, we do not believe in the total depravity and the total helplessness of man, even though we acknowledge him to be a sinner. And the Christian faith has a direct relationship to his natural goodness as well as a reference to his 'exceeding sinfulness'.

Niebuhr, following St. Paul, regards the whole difficulty as due to a defect in the human will — the good I would do, I do not. But when it is asked how this defect is to be dealt with, or, better still, how God deals with it, Niebuhr replies, in effect, 'He forces men to go His way'. The reason why history is so tragic is, if we understand Niebuhr aright, because God moves toward His ends *against* the human will. And here, it may be said in passing, is one of the most pleasing pieces of accommodation for the sub-Christian mind. Under this premise almost anything can be justified. For what does it matter what men do if it can always be countermanded by God? Niebuhr, quite naively, brings under this premise the explanation of America being thrown into the war. It was due to Divine initiative. God did it so that America, together with the rest of the free nations, could be linked in community, community being God's judgment for the world.

From this position, it is not a far step to say, as Niebuhr does, that the ideal of the League of Nations, in the immediate post-war world at any rate, will not be quite effective for the demands of justice. The way of community must be by way of justice gained by the preponderate power of the United Nations. Niebuhr admits, of course, that this is not going to be just, for the human heart is sinful. But it is the only way. And if, in the pursuance of it, the victorious nations are contrite, then forgiveness is assured and the way of the desirable imperfect world becomes possible. History is one — everything hangs together. An ideal peace, and a desirable community, cannot be isolated from the situation as it is. The solution of the modern problem of community by

victory to the Allies is an imperfect solution. The first need is the securing of justice, and justice belongs to the contrite heart exercising power in fear and trembling. The Axis Powers could not win the war because there is no victory for those who are unjust, and in this matter Niebuhr apparently accepts inevitability. If the Axis Powers had been a third more just, they might have just won the war. Even so, before God's judgment no man living is justified, and certainly no nation. There is always the pride of power and no man is free from it. It can only be mitigated by the fact of contrition. There is no peace amidst the world's ambiguity without the mercy of God. Yet justice is required if community is to be gained. And in collective relationships, men must think more about justice than about love. There is always national prejudice, and national pride, to contend with; but God, at work in history, is forcing men to go His way. That way, in the world of time, is the way of justice and community.

All this would appear to involve the acceptance of history as the story of justice. But, unfortunately for Niebuhr, it is not in the use of power, even when used with a heavy heart, that justice is in fact gained. And here again is made clear the gospel of doom. Justice, if enforced, is never just. Especially is this true when applied to nations. And if there is no real justice, there can be no true community. And without true community, God is frustrated and war becomes inevitable.

The difficulty of Niebuhr's argument arises because of his assumption of the total depravity of man—the assumption that man cannot do anything about life, except spoil it, until he is possessed of an uneasy conscience—and he makes the mistake, when dealing with history and the ways of nations, of regarding Christianity politically. That Christianity has to be applied politically is not denied. But if the Christian faith is a regenerating, re-energizing, and revitalizing revolutionary force, then surely justice can be taken in its stride. In short, love and all that love means creates its own justice as it goes along; a justice that those who seek, however heavy-heartedly, to be just by the exercise of power can never attain to. Moreover, while love can create justice, the justice of Niebuhr's kind, if indeed of any sort, can never create love. And surely it is love of which our lives are scant: it is love and more love that we want. Is it not the very essence of the Christian faith to believe that a converted people can, by their new life, secure what the imposition of force could never gain? But, it may be asked, can people be converted without first having been made to acquire an uneasy conscience? Maybe not. Niebuhr's position, however, leaves them, as we understand it, with an uneasy conscience as the only condition of gaining the highest standard of life possible between nations which themselves are all the time sub-Christian. That is, he has nothing save a proximate Christianity to offer to the world. Men go on step by step without any hope of realizing perfection or Utopia here on earth. Their hope, if they can deduce any at all from this position, is in heaven. A heaven on earth is out of the question. But why? Some people already live that sort of life which they cannot conceive to be any happier in heaven. That may or may not be to their credit. Nevertheless, we believe the world can have that sort of desirable and satisfying life, limited only to the extent that everything human is limited.

Niebuhr goes astray, in our judgment, because his premises are wrong. As



we see them, they are as follows: (a) Man is an irredeemable sinner, at least in the mass. (b) Human nature being what it is, the ideal can never be gained. (c) Love, the *esse* of Christianity, is impossible between nations and cannot be fully lived out by the individual. (d) Christianity, applied politically, must be conditioned by events. They may be called the four assumptions. Our reply is that man is not an irredeemable sinner; that human nature need not be, and in the Christian order of life will not be, as it is; that love, in the sense of seeking the good of others as opposed to a self-regarding way of life, is as true for nations as it is for individuals; and that Christianity, if applied in its fullness politically, conditions events and is not conditioned by them.

Just what the unattainable ideal of Niebuhr means in regard to specific matters of international and social significance ought to be made clear. It appears to involve the acceptance of the position that we shall never get rid of war, never escape social inequality, and never gain a Society that has ceased to be self-regarding. All that we can hope to do is to get a justice, albeit imperfect, that is only possible when the men who exercise power are in a state of fear and trembling. This, in effect, means that full justice will never be gained at all. For the possibilities are that, if there is no inevitability about the uneasy conscience, some will not gain it, others, as generations come and go, will spurn it, and the end will not be reached — even the end as advocated by the compromising gospel of Niebuhr. Once more, the uneasy conscience is a matter of contingency. We contend, on the other hand, that there is no contingency about the Christian faith. It belongs to the stuff and truth of life, is vital in God's plan for the world, and provides the evidence that Jesus is the clue to history. Instead of accommodating the sub-Christian mind, it is, in our view, the duty of Christian thinkers to challenge that mind. Man needs to be radically changed, not to be accommodated by specious pleas that seek to give satisfaction by providing a rationale of God's way with men. Man needs to know the revolutionary nature of Christianity, a nature that gains the power of the spirit rather than the power of material force. Indeed, the whole argument of Niebuhr is based on the unwarrantable assumption that material agencies create the operative spirit. Is not the truth rather that the spirit creates the desirable material instruments for its own use?

We believe that love — the *esse* of Christianity — can create a heaven on earth, a condition of life that people will both like and want. And we believe this is possible because man, in his own nature, is capable of the good. Much of man's failure is due to ignorance and much more is due to the system of life we have allowed to grow up, a system not so much due to the 'exceeding sinfulness' of the masses but to the exercising of an undue influence on life by the powerful few.

T. W. BEVAN

### THE GREAT COMMANDMENT: THOU SHALT LOVE

WHEN questions and criticism are put to the legitimate purpose of obtaining truth and enlightenment, the wise teacher, so far from attempting to suppress, will welcome them. He knows that his claims are met when their

use is prompted by sincere and honest motives; for, subject to that condition, nothing but good can follow. On the one hand, they give him the opportunity of removing doubt and misunderstanding, and of establishing the confidence of his hearers; on the other, they help to make clear the strength or weakness of his thought and to reveal any promise of permanency his teaching may possess. No statement can be true which fails to stand the test of reason and experience, and so the impartial critic often renders a worthy service by separating the wheat from the chaff and protecting public credulity from imposition. We owe much to the New Testament critics of Jesus; only when they had the ulterior motive of discrediting His work did He show resentment; seekers after truth He met with sympathy and encouragement, and rewarded their efforts with some of His deepest utterances. The Scribe who wished to know which was the greatest commandment was not only complimented on his own discernment, but also had the honour of calling forth the highest expression of the moral law the world has ever heard: 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind, and with all thy strength; . . . thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself.' Here Jesus gathered together all He had taught by precept and example under one comprehensive principle of love; so simple that ordinary people have no difficulty in understanding it, and so lofty that the saintliest never outgrow it. This love must flow from man's being in two streams: one directing towards God the affection of the heart, the devotion of the understanding and the obedience of the will; the other proceeding towards men with a recognition of their worth which never treats them less than equals. Its demands are so intensive that no individual can escape them, and so all-embracing that none is beyond the bounds of its application. It is not a statement free from difficulties; but a careful attempt to understand it will yield valuable results.

Its form is that of an imperative command, permitting no alternative to obedience, and this at once suggests a very important question. Can we be commanded to love? Does not love belong to a province of our nature wherein the soul must follow its own inclinations? No authority can make a man admire a beautiful picture, respond to a musical symphony, or go into raptures over the most exquisite landscape. If our response to these things is not spontaneous, it may suggest a very serious defect in our ability to appreciate the beautiful; but no command can remedy the deficiency. A similar problem springs out of our relation to men and women. Most of us know very good people who have never injured us, yet we cannot love them; whilst there are others to whom, on the first time of meeting and almost without knowing why, we unhesitatingly yield our affections in full confidence of good results. An authoress tells how, when a girl, she was commanded by her parents and grandmother to marry a man whom she did not love; under severe pressure she gave way; but in spite of serious efforts to love him, the marriage ended in disaster and misery. It seems we cannot love when and where we like; yet Jesus says we must.

The explanation is here: We have a habit of identifying love with feeling; Jesus did not. It has been said that feeling is the way in which we are affected by anything, e.g. by a thing that gives pleasure or pain, a condition of the body that makes us hungry or thirsty, a person who arouses our admiration or

disgust. To adopt this as a complete equivalent to love would imply what has just been said, that it is a feeling outside our control to which we cannot attach praise or censure. Obviously, Jesus did mean a quality of conduct within our own power for which we are responsible. Shall we say then, that love is conduct prompted by feeling? Only if we do not realize the danger of such a course. It would leave love without any guide to action apart from our likes and dislikes, and tend to destroy all sense of duty and obligation. Unfortunately, we can see the effect of this kind of love in the crude sentimentalism around us, whilst many of the disasters of married life are the result of responding to feeling without thought. Our own experience tells us that Jesus was right in making love all-inclusive; it not only impels the heart, but also the mind and the strength—in fact, the whole personality. A man must learn to control his feelings, develop his thoughts and guide his actions; and just because all men have the right to expect from us the quality of behaviour we hope to receive from them, good conduct prompted by right thinking is a duty. We are very often very much like a ship in a storm. Our feelings resemble the winds and waves which dash us hither and thither; the will is the captain of the vessel who must steer us past the rocks and shoals that threaten to destroy us; but it is thought which informs the will where the danger lies and shows the direction of the safe harbour. The command of Jesus is to cultivate the feelings by thinking what is true and doing what is right in our contact with others. Thinking and doing are not the whole of love, but they do form a practical basis upon which we can begin to express a life of devotion to God and service to our fellow men; and if we are true here, love will cease to wear the stern aspect of a commandment and will become a way of life acceptable for its own sake, the affections will one day burst into flame and duty will be absorbed in the warmth and enthusiasm of a spontaneous devotion.

The authority of this law written upon our hearts rests upon nothing less than the nature of things. When man was created in God's image, he was, at least, endowed with a capacity of wisdom, righteousness, truth and love; and from this we may conclude that when the material world with all its baffling perplexities was brought into being, it must have been designed to harmonize with principles which would make it a suitable place of abode in which man could develop these spiritual endowments. Without this congruity between man's nature and his environment, there would have been a frustration of his capacities whenever he sought to exercise them; and consequently, any accumulation of knowledge, or progress towards civilization as we know it, would have been impossible. If man could have done any real thinking in respect to the cause of such a condition of things, the idea might have occurred to him that the Creator had given expression to two incompatible purposes calculated to defeat their own ends. The present state of man's attainments justifies us in saying that nothing so irrational has taken place; and so we may affirm that God, man and nature form three elements of one universe whose fundamental law is love. This means that morality and religion are not the result of arbitrary laws laid upon us by an Almighty Ruler for His pleasure; they are the essential elements of our being, the outcome of our freedom to think and act. You cannot picture society without individual freedom, and so goodness and love are necessary to our well-being. When we violate this law of love, we are stultifying our

own nature and banishing ourselves from that true relationship with God and man which is the real source of all our happiness and service. So true is this that if all the Governments of the world were to unite in commanding their subjects to do something positively wicked — to seek each his own well-being by cheating and plundering his neighbours — the only hope for mankind would lie in their disobedience. The authority of the law, then, springs out of that Divine image in which God has created us. States may justly hope to improve their subjects by working in harmony with it; but when tyrants endeavour to crush it, it throws a halo around any rebel who can say with Luther: 'Here I stand. I can do no otherwise. So help me God.'

From what has been said it follows that the sphere of the law is universal. Perfect love knows no limitations. Racism stops with colour of skin, patriotism is confined within national boundaries, class feeling cannot pass social barriers; but love surmounts all obstacles, annihilates all artificial distinctions and sees a brother in every man. Such a statement at a time when the world's normal life is disorganized by hatred and cruelty will almost inevitably evoke the question, Can we love our enemies, e.g. the Germans? If we rightly understand the words of Jesus, we must. Moral capacity is the distinctive quality of every normal human being, and moral conduct based upon righteousness, truth and justice is the indispensable condition of good fellowship and mutual helpfulness between both nations and individuals. This being so, it is the duty of every man, guided by the highest knowledge he possesses, to exercise good will towards others, and thereby, as far as possible, to increase the world's moral values; and this implies the complementary duty of opposing what is wrong, and so defending from injury the world's standard of worthy behaviour. No man can exclude these duties from the love which Jesus said must regard a neighbour's rights as its own. If we knew a man who persisted in doing wrong to the injury of his fellows and to his own degeneration, we could not *feel* towards him as we would if he were striving for saintliness; but we should prove our love by continuing to think and act with a view to his reformation. Further, if we had authority over him, as a parent over his child, love might dictate his punishment as our duty, in order to make him sensible of the dignity, value and necessity of right conduct. It is a true feeling that shrinks from the administration of punishment, and a wise law that takes it out of private hands. But suppose an injury were done to us personally, and we ourselves had to mete out the punishment, Christian love would eliminate all desire for revenge and self-gratification, and demand that we should act as the guardians of goodness and the agents of the Divine power that ordained the moral order of the world. Thus punishment would become the expression of the love that shares the suffering of the offender, though he still continue to regard himself as our enemy.

While the law of love is universal it is intensely individual. The Divine voice imposes upon each man's conscience duties which extend to all other men, and the reciprocal fulfilment of these obligations constitutes the moral achievements of mankind. It is in this moral intercourse of individuals that we find the strength of those ties that bind life to life, and the origin of those groups of people who seek to build up and protect a better social structure. For it is from the individual to the community and not in the reverse direction, as is some-

times supposed, that the normal course of moral development proceeds. The community furnishes opportunities of progress, but the capacity and urge to make use of them are born in the individual. The law dominates all our interests and imparts whatever value they possess. Wealth, culture and social influence, all have worth; but it is not intrinsic to them: it is derived from the extent to which the law has governed their attainment and use. It is this Divine element in life that lifts a man above what is merely local and temporal, and sets him in an order of things where the highest value resides in character. We respect a man who excels in education, leadership, or executive ability; but it is really his character that makes respect possible, for if he fails in this, attraction turns to aversion. So deeply penetrating are these moral demands that if a man tell a lie, or perform a bad deed, then, in spite of his success in eluding the suspicion of those about him, he cannot respect himself; and the feeling that humbles him is not the regret that might follow an unfortunate investment of his money or an accident to his property, but the shame and self-reproach of having degraded his personal worth. On the other hand, a man in humble circumstances without education or influence to commend him, but living in loyalty to conscience and duty, commands the homage we readily render, because his conduct reveals the essence of nobility.

Generally speaking, we dislike laws, they impose restrictions and fetter our activities; but the Christian law is different. It is not a verbal commandment, but a life: 'The Word was made flesh and dwelt among us.' The Personality of Jesus reveals the essential qualities of our own being, what we should be if we were perfect, what we long to be in our best moments; and as we see Him moving among men, healing their sick, carrying their sorrows, forgiving their sins, we feel that the law becomes loving and lovable. By His knowledge and sympathy Jesus identifies Himself with us, and we learn to look upon life as He did; until His goodness, justice and truth reveal themselves in all their beauty, and we discover that the kingdom of love, like the blue sky, is not something above and beyond us; but we are in it.

JOHN T. NEWTON

---

### THE *SUMMUM BONUM* OF THE HINDU AND OF THE BUDDHIST COMPARED AND CONTRASTED

SCHOLARS who have studied the *Vedas* — the most ancient writings of India — speak of the joyousness of the early Aryans as reflected in those books. The gods they worshipped were the great phenomena of nature — the Sun, the Dawn, the Sky, the Storm, and many others. They conceived these great powers to be so far personal as to be able to hear and help, and they offered up sacrifices and prayers to them. These early pioneers do not seem to have been overawed by the wonderful phenomena they worshipped, but rather to have rejoiced and gloried in them as powers friendly to themselves.

Not only did these men live a full, and free, and joyous life on earth, but they died with a glorious hope of joining their ancestors in another, and even more desirable, world where they would live in the presence of the gods for ever.



This belief in a future life was strong, and, apparently, universal among them.

Before Gautama Buddha was born this joy in life, and hope in death, had faded away, and a gloomy pessimism had taken its place. Both the minds and hearts of Indians were overwhelmed by the belief in Karma and Transmigration. They conceived themselves to be bound upon 'the Wheel of Life' — behind them an immeasurable past of suffering, and before them an immeasurable future of births and deaths, heavens and hells, and griefs unutterable.

As Gautama himself said when speaking to his disciples about life as suffering and grief, 'Pilgrimage (*Samsara*) of beings, my disciples, has its beginning in eternity. No opening can be discovered from which proceeding creatures, mazed in ignorance, fettered by the thirst for being, stray and wander'. He was but giving expression to the thought that oppressed men's hearts: the memory of the past filled them with anguish, and before the future the bravest spirit quailed.

Unless we are able to enter into wholehearted sympathy with the men of Gautama's generation, we cannot hope to understand Nirvana, or to conceive how it came to mean for them 'bliss ineffable'. They lived in a world of 'Dependent Origination' where there is infinity of cause and effect. Each cycle is but the successor of that which went before, and this cycle will be followed by others — they are simply the cycles of the *Samsara* (the sequence of the arising, transition, decay, passing away, and re-arising of beings), eternal except for one possibility.

Can we wonder that as men meditated upon *Samsara*, as they concentrated their thoughts upon it, they declared all existence to be evil and misery? Men were oppressed: a great dread lay upon them, and their souls cried out for deliverance. Some, in the agony of their despair, turned to the gods, who could only be approached through the Brahman priest, the adept in magic and ritual. But the more thoughtful and spiritual of the people perceived the vanity of this appeal to the gods for deliverance from the power of Karma and Rebirth, seeing that the gods themselves, like men, were subject to the same dread powers.

The greatness of men's needs forced them to believe that behind this phenomenal world of 'becoming and decay' there must be *reality, permanence*, and they conceived the idea of *Brahman*,<sup>1</sup> the source of all that is, but Himself desireless, actionless, quiescent. As a later development there was evolved *Atman*, the Supreme Soul of the universe; the *Consciousness* as distinct from the material elements of the universe, from whom is derived the consciousness of man, the *self*.

Later on *Atman* became identified in men's minds with *Brahman*, as the 'One Reality' behind the phenomenal universe, and men came to regard the human soul as the offspring of the great Brahman-*Atman*. It followed, therefore, that, as the 'All-Soul' was *real* as distinct from the phenomenal world, so the soul of man was conceived to be the *one abiding reality* amidst the impermanence of material things. From this conception it was not difficult to pass to the further conception of 'Brahman is I' and 'I am Brahman'. Out of this

<sup>1</sup> Distinguish carefully between Brahman, neuter, and Brahṃā, the personal god. The incomprehensible *Brahman* is manifested in the Triad — *Brahṃā*, the Creator; *Vishṇu*, the Preserver; and *Śiva*, the Destroyer.

thought came the belief in the possibility of absorption into the 'Supreme' at death.

Here was a way of escape from phenomenal life, from the world of impermanence. Here was the possibility of deliverance from the 'Wheel of Life', from suffering, sorrow, death and rebirth. This great end could not be attained through sacrificing priest or phenomenal god, but it might be attained through effort, self-conquest, and above all through knowledge — the knowledge 'I am Brahman'. For while final deliverance comes through knowledge of the Brahman, this knowledge can only come through the conquest of desire.

When he has set himself free  
from every desire of his heart,  
The mortal enters immortal  
into the Brahman here below.

Deliverance may be represented on the one hand as coming from the knowledge 'I am Brahman', and on the other through freedom from desire. 'If a man knows the Atman "that I am I" wishing what, for the sake of what desire, should he cling to the bodily state?' Being the Eternal Atman he is not bound by Transmigration or Karma. In his new knowledge he stands emancipated for ever, free from the fetters of Karma whether of past or future actions. The experience has brought him such a joy and elation of spirit that he can never fall to the old levels again. He is for ever free.

This conception of 'identification of self with the Atman', and all that it implies, is a very sublime conception: the topmost pinnacle of the temple of Indian speculative thought. But it is not a moral conception. Brahman has no interest in man's conduct, that is to say in his relations with his fellow men. Morality, to the Indian seeker, means complete severance of self from the world, and not an active participation in the affairs of the world — the world and men are nothing to him. It is well to bear this in mind.

There is another point that we must not overlook. Man has become his own saviour. He alone, without the help of man or God, has the power to turn aside from the world, to conquer self, and to achieve salvation. This has a very important bearing upon Gautama Buddha's doctrine of Nirvana, and we shall refer to it again.

We have traced the development of Indian religious and philosophical thought from the age of the early Aryan settlers to the days of Gautama, and we must now deal very briefly with the points of agreement and of difference between the Hindu and Buddhist conception of the 'Supreme Good'.

To both the devout Hindu and to Gautama life experienced was sorrow and pain. We overhear the Buddha meditating aloud, 'Verily, the world has fallen upon trouble with its births, and ageing, and dying, and rebirth, and from this suffering, no man knoweth any way of escape. O! when shall a way out from this suffering, from decay and death, be made known!' The object of the Buddha's life was to find out the way of escape, and to show others how to find it, and to enter it. The time came when he believed that he had found the way while meditating under the Bo-tree.

Both the devout Hindu and Gautama believed that behind the veil of ignorance which enshrouded the *unseen* there lay something wonderful at the heart

of the universe. They strove equally to rend away the veil and to discover the supreme secret. Up to this point their aspirations and their experiences were very similar. The surprise came when the veil of ignorance was torn aside, for, to the Hindu there stood revealed God, self, eternal life, bliss ineffable. Gautama, however, perceived behind that veil neither God, nor soul, but only the Universal Law of Cause and Effect. This was his great discovery under the Bo-tree, namely, 'the process of the natural, necessary, universal law, by which all things, bodily and mental, *happened*, or became nascent, static, and expiring'.

Both the Hindu and the Buddhist accepts the doctrine of Karma, which he regards as the law of absolute justice for all sentient beings in earth, and heaven, and hell. According to the theory of Karma, not only must all wrongdoing be punished to the uttermost (and, of course all well-doing rewarded to the uttermost), but the whole of the punishment must be endured by the wrongdoer himself; no man can share it with him, and there is no being, human or divine, who can save him from any part of the suffering. The possibility of vicarious suffering is ruled out absolutely.

This theory embraces the past as well as the future. In view of the unequal fortunes of men — the, apparently, arbitrary distribution of wealth and poverty, sickness and health, honour and dishonour — it assumes that the explanation of life, as we know it, must be sought in the deeds of former lives. Karma is the universal law of causation working in the moral sphere. This law works itself out with mathematical certainty. Every life receives precisely what it deserves, not a fraction more, and not a fraction less.

For the moment the wicked seem to prosper, the good to go unrewarded. But not in the end. The law of Karma will see to it that he suffers every jot and tittle of the consequences due to him. There is no such thing as undeserved suffering, just as there is no room for forgiveness, mercy, atonement. Every man must suffer the full consequences of his deeds, even though it may take an eternity of lives to do so. This theory cannot be proved, but it is a working hypothesis which appears to solve some of the most pressing problems of existence, and some men regard it as a solution of the age-long problem of suffering.

The Hindu and the Buddhist are in complete agreement about Karma as described above. But note carefully that, according to the Hindu theory of Karma and Transmigration the soul passes from existence to existence, bearing always its Karma, the good and evil consequences of its deeds. The Hindu believes the soul to be real, permanent, indestructible. At the death of the body it reincarnates itself in a new body. This has been going on from the illimitable past, because the soul has no conceivable beginning, and it must go on for ever, unless the soul attains unto absorption into the Brahman-Atman.

We have already seen that the Buddha repudiated the soul theory of the Hindus. He held that all things in this world, and in every conceivable world, are transitory and impermanent. Everything is in a state of flux. There is no *being*, but only 'becoming and passing away'. This doctrine applies equally to living beings and to inanimate things. There is nothing that corresponds to our idea of *substance*, no underlying persistent reality, in material things. And in living beings, including man, there is no permanent element, physical or

spiritual, that will survive the death of the body. Not even the gods, in whom the Buddha believed, are exempt from this law.

The Buddha taught that man's greatest delusion is his belief that he is an individual, a person, separate and distinct from other men, and from the universe at large. The man who believes this will cling to his individual existence; he will have a strong will to live, the thought of non-existence will be intolerable to him. Now it is this 'will to live' that binds him to the 'wheel of life', and causes rebirth. But the man who perceives that the self he took to be *real* is only a shadow, a phantasm of the mind, has the assurance in his own heart, 'This is my last existence; when death comes it is the end of all: there will be no more rebirth.'

The initial difficulty of understanding Buddhism, at least for Western students, is to conceive of life being carried on without *personal* agents. Old Buddhaghosa sums it all up in a verse:—

Misery only doth exist, none miserable.  
No doer is there; naught but the deed is found.  
Nirvana is, but not the man who seeks it.  
The Path exists, but not the traveller on it.'

I have dealt with this subject at length elsewhere.<sup>1</sup>

Though the Buddha could not accept the Hindu theory of the Transmigration of the Soul, he clung to the doctrine of Karma. He believed as passionately as they did in the Law of Absolute Justice. But this was a very difficult doctrine to fit into his system, because if there is no soul to be reborn how can Karma work itself out? He solved the problem by substituting for Transmigration the doctrine of a series of rebirths, with Karma taking the place of the soul as a connecting link between one existence and the next.

This theory is much more difficult to understand than the Hindu theory, and neither the Buddha, nor any of his disciples, have given a rational explanation of it. It must be accepted by faith as the word of the Buddha. We are told that '*nothing that is anything* passes at death into the new body, only Karma passes'. Not even consciousness passes over. The new being is credited with all the merits and demerits of his predecessor in the *Karmic series* whose Karma he has inherited. This seems incompatible with the law of Karma itself. I have no space to follow up this question further here, but I have discussed it in detail elsewhere.<sup>2</sup>

It follows from this that the Supreme Good of the Hindu and of the Buddhist is radically different. The Hindu came to believe that the way of escape from suffering for him was through the personal realization of identity of self with the Atman, as we have already explained in detail.

The Buddhist believes that he attains the Supreme Good by the intellectual realization and personal experience of the fact of *an-atta* (I am not — I). The man who enjoys that knowledge has attained *nirvana*, and is able to sing:—

Joy of all joy, bliss of all bliss is this,  
To leave behind the lie which says, 'I am.'

Nirvana is conceived of as something to be enjoyed here and now. At the

<sup>1</sup> *Outline of Buddhism*, chapters viii and ix.

<sup>2</sup> See *Ibid* chapter x.

end of the struggle to maintain the fiction of individual existence, from which all sorrow proceeds, comes the cessation of desire, sorrowlessness, peace, quietness, ineffable bliss. You hear the saint singing:—

Enough for me, I want no heaven of gods!  
Heart's pain, heart's pining have I trained away.

The Buddha believed that countless existences come and go, but that at last an existence blossoms into *real* knowledge, saintship, perfection, and then passes away for ever.

But what happens to the saint at death? The Hindu saint loses himself in God, as the raindrop is lost in the ocean its source and goal: *individuality* is gone, but *not* existence. This state is called *Moksha* or *Mukti*.

The Buddhist saint attains *Pari-nirvana*, which a Buddhist writer says is best described in the terms of mathematics as *remainderlessness*. The elements of being are dissolved, consciousness has finally flickered out, all mental processes have ceased to be. Whatever *Pari-nirvana* may be conceived to be, it is at least *inanimate*.

CHARLES H. S. WARD

## ADOWN THE STREAM OF TIME: A LITERARY REVERIE

A WONDERFUL stream is the River Time  
As it runs through the realms of Tears;  
With a faultless rhythm, and a musical rhyme,  
And broader sweep, and a surge sublime,  
As it blends with the ocean of Years. . . .

Benjamin Taylor's verse impressively reminds us of the swift, inexorable flow of the stream of Time — a River down which we are all ruthlessly carried, being brought daily nearer to the harbour of our final Destiny. Perhaps many people have known thoughts akin to those of the Puritan poet as he stood musing 'on the bridge at midnight' beneath the silvery moon and felt the pull of the sea:

How often, O, how often,  
In the days that had gone by,  
I had stood on that bridge at midnight  
And gazed on that wave and sky!

How often, O, how often,  
I had wished that the ebbing tide  
Would bear me away on its bosom  
O'er the ocean wild and wide! <sup>1</sup>

Have we not all started on that journey? As the old year, with its unrealized dreams and unfulfilled ambitions is left behind for ever, and we launch out into the new — are we not doomed to be carried by the resistless tide of Time?

<sup>1</sup> Longfellow: *Poetical Works* (Routledge), 'The Bridge', p. 515.



And if so, whither are we bound? To what new enterprises and adventures will the New Year transport us?

'Whither, thou turbid wave?  
Whither, with so much haste,  
As if a thief wert thou?'

'I am the Wave of Life,  
Stained with my margin's dust;  
From the struggle and the strife  
Of the narrow stream I fly  
To the Sea's immensity,  
To wash from me the slime  
Of the muddy banks of Time.'<sup>1</sup>

But what is that which we call Time? Is it a reality, or merely a phantom? Is it one of the stern and inflexible ingredients of our complex universe, or simply a figment of man's fertile imagination? Can we speak of Time as our friend: or only as the inveterate foe of all mankind?

People would answer such questions differently, according to their outlook on life and their attitude to Time. Moreover, each one of us may change his opinion in keeping with the mood of the moment. Even so, the words of our writers and poets who speak about the flight of Time reflect an almost infinite variety of mood, according to the personal experiences of each. Let us travel with them on the journey!

The irrevocableness of Time past is the thought behind the lustreless lines of Omar Khayyám — yesterday is for ever beyond recall, and its deeds unalterable:

The Moving Finger writes; and having writ  
Moves on; nor all your Piety nor Wit  
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,  
Nor all your Tears wash out a Word of it.<sup>2</sup>

Tennyson similarly bids us forget the past and not waste energy in mourning over the experiences of that which is less amenable to change than iron or marble. The past is out of sight; let it be also out of mind:

Wherefore waste your heart  
In looking on the chill and changeless Past?  
Iron will fuse and marble melt; the Past  
Remains the Past.

The Past is like a travell'd land,  
Now sunk below the horizon.<sup>3</sup>

Even more cheerless and uncomfoting is the verse attributed to Sir Walter Raleigh, the Elizabethan sailor and man of letters. Just before his death he speaks sadly of the remorselessness of Time:

<sup>1</sup> Longfellow: *op. cit.*, 'The Wave', from the German, p. 42.

<sup>2</sup> Persian, twelfth century, Fitzgerald's translation.

<sup>3</sup> *Works* (Macmillan, Globe Edn.), 'The Promise of May'.

Even such is Time, that takes on trust  
 Our youth, our joys, our all we have,  
 And pays us, but with age and dust —  
 Who in the dark and silent grave  
 When we have wandered all our ways  
 Shuts up the story of our days.

An identical prospect is visualized by a fifteenth-century Spanish author, who writes thus:

Our lives are rivers, gliding free  
 To that unfathomed, boundless sea,  
 The silent grave!  
 Thither all earthly pomp and boast  
 Roll, to be swallowed up and lost  
 In one dark wave.

Thither the mighty torrents stray,  
 Thither the brook pursues its way,  
 And tinkling rill.  
 There all are equal. . . .<sup>1</sup>

In a striking passage Thomas Carlyle exhibits our puny helplessness in the stealthy clutches of Time's mysterious power, making Time appear more of a reality than ourselves:

'Time — the great mystery, the illimitable, silent, never-resting thing called Time; rolling, rushing on, swift, like an all-embracing ocean tide, on which we and all the Universe swim like exhalations, like apparitions which ARE and then ARE NOT. . . .'

Ancient mythology also suggests that Time is a remorseless Conqueror, a relentless force waiting to crush puny man. Though he sometimes thinks himself the master and not the servant of Time, man cannot possibly escape defeat. An old Norse legend, for example, says that when the mighty Thor set out upon a great adventure one of his antagonists was an old and apparently feeble woman, with whom he had to wrestle. The task appeared so easy that Thor advanced lightly and carelessly to the fray — but he was overthrown and the old hag remained victor. She was Time, and none could stand against her might. In spite of the accumulated wisdom of the ages the shadow of that old Woman still stretches across the world, striking fear into men's hearts as it reminds them of Time, the remorseless Conqueror.

In other lines the novel idea is presented that as the human soul is carried rapidly along the stream of Life its safe passage is threatened by a host of spectral watchers on the river banks:

I have read, in the marvellous heart of man,  
 That strange and mystic scroll,  
 That an army of phantoms vast and wan  
 Beleaguer the human soul.

<sup>1</sup> Longfellow: *op. cit.*, p. 23. From the Spanish.

## ADOWN THE STREAM OF TIME

Encamped beside Life's rushing stream,  
 In Fancy's misty light,  
 Gigantic shapes and shadows gleam  
 Portentous through the night.

Upon its midnight battle-ground  
 The spectral camp is seen,  
 And, with a sorrowful, deep sound,  
 Flows the River of Life between.<sup>1</sup>

One of the bitterest expressions in our poetry of Time is that written by Wilfrid Scawen Blunt. It again portrays the incessant struggle between man and the monster Time — ending as usual in the victory of the latter:

I long have had a quarrel set with Time  
 Because he robb'd me. Every day of life  
 Was wrested from me after bitter strife:  
 I never yet could see the sun go down  
 But I was angry in my heart . . .  
 . . . I have known  
 No truce with Time nor Time's accomplice, Death.

What have we done to Thee, thou monstrous Time?  
 What have we done to Death, that we must die?<sup>2</sup>

Lord Byron's description in *Childe Harold* treats of Time in a somewhat friendlier guise, and reveals a superior insight on the part of that erratic genius. Time is still the Avenger, the chastener and corrector of men, but her work is also one of healing and restoration:

O Time! the beautifier of the dead,  
 Adorner of the ruin, comforter  
 And only healer when the heart hath bled —  
 Time! the corrector where our judgments err,  
 The test of truth, love — sole philosopher,  
 For all beside are sophists, from thy thrift,  
 Which never loses, though it doth defer —  
 Time, the avenger! unto thee I lift  
 My hands, and eyes, and heart, and crave of thee a gift.<sup>3</sup>

The swiftness of Time's passing, and that we live only one day at a time, is the thought stressed by Robert Herrick, the Devonshire parson:

Gather ye rosebuds while ye may,  
 Old Time is still a-flying;  
 And this same flower that smiles to-day,  
 To-morrow will be dying.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Longfellow, *op. cit.*, p. 10, 'The Beleagured City'.

<sup>2</sup> W. S. Blunt (1840-1922): *Poetical Works* (Macmillan).

<sup>3</sup> *Works* (Nimmo), Canto IV, p. 159.

<sup>4</sup> 'To the Virgins' in *Pure Gold* (Jack), p. 54.

The relatively temporary nature of Time is also suggested in Henry Vaughan's vision of Eternity, in which the world, with her attendant satellites, is lost:

I saw Eternity the other night  
Like a great ring of pure and endless light,  
All calm, as it was bright;  
And round beneath it, Time in hours, days, years,  
Driven by the spheres  
Like a vast shadow mov'd; in which the world  
And all her train were hurl'd.<sup>1</sup>

That Time means opportunity to men is an oft-recurring theme, linked with the warning that to-day only is ours.

John Ruskin writes: 'Let every dawn of morning be to you as the beginning of life, and every setting sun be to you as its close. And let every one of these short lives leave its sure record of some kindly thing done for others.'

R. W. Emerson, American poet and essayist, exhorts:

Youth . . .  
Teach thy feet to feel the ground  
Ere yet arrives the wintry day  
When Time thy feet has bound.  
Take the bounty of thy birth,  
Taste the lordship of the earth.<sup>2</sup>

Also he writes elsewhere: 'The days are made on a loom whereof the warp and woof are past and future time . . . Write it on your heart that every day is the best day in the year. No man has learnt anything rightly, until he knows that every day is Doomsday.'

From Epictetus, the Stoic sage, come these words of wisdom: 'Make use of Time, if thou lovest eternity. Know that yesterday cannot be recalled, and that to-morrow cannot be assured. To-day only is thine. One to-day is worth two to-morrows.'

We have thus travelled far from the thought of Time as the inexorable enemy of human kind, a ruthless conqueror and a hard taskmaster. 'Make use of Time' suggests that it may be regarded as an ally; yea, even as the handmaid and servant of man. Man assuredly has a voice in the ordering of his own destiny, and some responsibility for the direction in which he travels: though he usually mistrusts the full truth of Henley's brave dictum:

'I am the master of my fate;  
I am the captain of my soul.'

This less servile attitude to Time is splendidly illustrated in one of the Letters of F. W. Robertson, who had formed the habit of arranging carefully each evening his programme of the following day's duties. 'The thought of Time, to me at least,' he writes, 'is a very overpowering one . . . Time rushing on, unbroken, irresistible, hurrying the world and the ages into being, and out of it, and making our "noisy years seem moments in the being of the eternal Silence".'

<sup>1</sup> *Poems* (Methuen), 'The World', p. 97.

<sup>2</sup> *Oxford Book of American Verse* (O.U.P.), 'From Monadnoc', p. 38.

The sense of powerlessness which this gives is very painful. But I have felt that this is neutralized by such a little plan as that. You feel that you do control your own course; you are borne on, but not resistlessly. Down the rapids you go, certainly. But you are steering and trimming your own raft, and making the flood of Time your vassal, and not your conqueror.'

Though on the journey our frail barque is buffeted by the waves we must sometime reach the harbour, saying farewell to all that is left behind. Emerson beautifully presents this thought:

Good-bye, proud world! I'm going home:  
Thou art not my friend, and I'm not thine.  
Long through thy weary crowds I roam;  
A river-ark on the ocean brine,  
Long I've been tossed like the driven foam;  
But now, proud world! I'm going home.<sup>1</sup>

A more confident faith shines in his other verse:

I trim myself to the storm of time,  
I man the rudder, reef the sail,  
Obey the voice at eve obeyed at prime:  
Lowly faithful, banish fear,  
Right onward drive unharmed:  
The port, well worth the cruise, is near,  
And every wave is charmed.<sup>2</sup>

May it not be true — as Longfellow declares in his 'Hyperion' — that the real significance of Time resides not in external things, in seasons, or hours, or clocks or years, but in the soul of man? This idea is a big step forward and has profound implications. He writes: 'What is Time? the shadow on a dial — the striking of a clock — the running of the sand — day and night — summer and winter — months, years, centuries: these are but arbitrary and outward signs, the measure of Time — not Time itself: Time is the Life of the Soul. . . .'

Henry Van Dyke also comes near to unveiling the secret of Time in his revelation of the truth that ultimately the thing that matters is a man's attitude and condition — the 'set of his soul'. The individual who can pass muster in this respect need have no fear of Time or of what Time can do.

Time is  
Too slow for those who wait,  
Too swift for those who fear,  
Too long for those who grieve,  
Too short for those who rejoice,  
But for those who Love  
Time is not.

The wise man will therefore face life philosophically — refusing to be downhearted when the tide seems to be strongly against him, or to be unduly elated when carried on the crest of a wave of prosperity or happiness. He will remem-

<sup>1</sup> *Oxford Book of American Verse*, Poem, 'Good-bye', p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> See *Outline of Lit.*, Ed. Jn. Drinkwater (Newnes), p. 492.



ber always that day follows night, spring succeeds winter, peace cometh after a storm.

Shelley points out that in winter Nature is only sleeping, waiting to burst forth into newness of life and freshness of beauty at the touch of Spring. May it not be that something the same is possible in our little lives — that when Time here is no more and we have 'shuffled off this mortal coil' a timeless eternal Spring somewhere awaits us? In the light of such a faith each succeeding New Year reveals itself only as a friend and not as an enemy.

As the wild air stirs and sways  
The tree-swung cradle of a child,  
So the breath of these rude days  
Rocks the year:—be calm and mild,  
Trembling hours, — she will arise  
With new love within her eyes.

January grey is here,  
Like a sexton by her grave;  
February bears the bier,  
March with grief doth howl and rave,  
And April weeps — but, O, ye hours,  
Follow with May's fairest flowers.<sup>1</sup>

BENJAMIN RICHARDS

<sup>1</sup> *Shelley* (Nelson's Poets), 'Dirge For The Year', p. 409.

## Notes and Discussions

### REUNION — IS THERE A DEADLOCK?<sup>1</sup>

Two books are to hand that together exemplify the present position about re-union. The names of their writers are a sufficient guarantee of their excellence. Father Hebert seeks to integrate the Anglo-Catholic faith under the term 'form'. Mr. Thompson's aim is of smaller scope. His book is a persuasive argument on behalf of the South India Scheme. It is addressed mainly to High Churchmen, for the chief recent criticisms of the scheme, at least in writing, have come from them. Yet his whole book, of course, presupposes a certain doctrine of the Church. If it be compared with Father Hebert's, one can only say, as some sadly say about the political situation in India, 'the dead-lock continues'.

Mr. Thompson relies mainly on two arguments. The first is an argument *ad hominem*. He says, in effect, 'This Scheme proposes that, while episcopacy is accepted, its interpretation is left open. It may be interpreted as *de jure divino*, or it may be accepted pragmatically — that is, as the best method of furthering the purposes of Christ in the world to-day. Has not this always been so in the Anglican Church?' The answer must be 'Yes'. Mr. Thompson urges also here that 'the constitutional episcopacy' proposed by the Scheme is of the very type that the Anglican Church has itself adopted wherever it has spread outside England. Here too he is right. The

<sup>1</sup> *The Church, Catholic and Free*, by Edgar W. Thompson, M.A. (Epworth Press, 4s.)  
*The Form of the Church*, by A. G. Hebert. (Faber & Faber, 8s. 6d.)

Scheme follows in fact the Anglican type. This ought not, however, to prejudice Free Churchmen against it *per se*, for under a constitutional episcopacy some justice, at any rate, is done both to Presbyterian (and Methodist) principles and to Congregationalist (and Baptist) principles. Mr. Thompson is able to add that some High Churchmen, such as Bishop Palmer, have blessed the Scheme. The *argumentum ad hominem* looks unanswerable. Yet Father Hebert will admit none of it. He agrees with Père Congar that the Anglican 'comprehensiveness', which Mr. Thompson values so highly, cannot be a basis for re-union. To him any pragmatic doctrine of episcopacy is anathema. If he were pressed, he would have to say that men like Bishop Palmer have 'sold the pass'. For him 'schemes of reunion which propose to bring together different denominations in one church order' on the model of Anglican 'comprehension' are all wrong. It may be urged that if such Anglo-Catholics as Father Hebert reject comprehensiveness in South India, they ought to leave the Anglican Church, but is this so? John Stuart Mill, in a day when the advocates of women's suffrage seemed to most Englishmen to be fools, set himself to champion it, with ultimate success. He did not leave an old society where women had no votes, but it would have been quite another thing for Mill to consent to the founding of a new commonwealth where only men voted. There is no doubt that men like Father Hebert, believing that God is on their side, expect that at long last their doctrine of the Church will triumph in a reunited Christendom.

In his second main argument Mr. Thompson approaches his subject from the other end. He traces the change that has taken place in Free Church belief both about episcopacy and about reunion. He says rightly that the pragmatic doctrine of Church organization, original in Methodism, has made great strides in the other non-episcopal churches, and that multitudes of Free Churchmen have come to believe that corporate reunion is the will of God. Here he over-states his case a little, for there is an unknown number of Congregationalists and Baptists who still believe in the autonomy of the local church, the 'high' Presbyterian doctrine of Cooper and Wotherspoon is not extinct, and there are even many Methodists who believe that God wills a spiritual unity that would express itself in Inter-Communion and not in a single organization. None the less the tide runs as Mr. Thompson says, and I myself rejoice that it does so. But of course Father Hebert, while he passionately believes that because Christ is one His church must be one, can make no terms with the pragmatic doctrine of the Church. Mr. Thompson, speaking of bishops, says that a 'great Church' needs 'great ministers'. For Father Hebert size is of course just irrelevant here. Again, Mr. Thompson quotes the declaration of a number of Archbishops and Bishops in 1926 that the Free Church Ministries are 'within their several spheres real ministries in the Universal Church', but did not later explanations come near to explaining this away? For Father Hebert, as for many Free Churchmen, all such statements suffer from a lamentable ambiguity. More than once Mr. Thompson himself finds it hard to understand what the late Archbishop Temple really meant.

Just now the favourite word at this point is 'irregular', and Mr. Thompson seems to think that Free Churchmen should accept the word. It *must* be accepted in its *literal* sense, for through very many centuries episcopal ordination was the universal *regula* or rule in the Christian Church. It is the rule in the larger part of Christendom to-day, even though Mr. Thompson is surely mistaken in saying that 'the non-episcopal communions are few and small in comparison with the episcopal'. But the word 'irregular' is not used in a merely literal sense. Mr. Thompson quotes Wesley's use of the word, for instance about lay preaching. But what Wesley said, in effect, was 'It is true that lay preaching is to-day irregular, but it is justifiable because it furthers the purposes of Christ'. He justified it because it was *effective*. Free Church

Ministries stand this test all right. But some Anglicans use the word 'irregular' to mean 'contrary to God's rule and therefore *defective*'. One more ambiguity!

For both our authors the primary function of bishops is to be guardians of doctrine. Whether this has always been their primary function in practice we need not now inquire. Mr. Thompson, however, criticizes the South Indian Scheme as being un-democratic because it does provide in a very roundabout way for a possible over-riding of an episcopal decision on doctrine. His argument seems to me mistaken, and the arrangement that he prefers to base on the old concept of 'degree' which Mr. C. S. Lewis has displayed for us in his study of Milton rather than on democracy, but, since the pragmatic account of Church government does not require that this should always be democratic, there is no need to examine the question in detail. The recent suggestion, made by the Anglican Church of India, Burmah and Ceylon, that, if and when the South Indian Scheme is consummated, all the Ministers of all the Churches should receive 'supplemental Ordination', is more important. Mr. Thompson devotes an appendix to it, and urges its acceptance. It is not meant to be merely a commission to work in a larger church — to enlarge 'jurisdiction' — but also to carry a 'further grace of Orders'. The operative word for the immediate purpose is 'further'. One can imagine an Anglo-Catholic saying 'Are not some things done once for all? Would anyone speak of "Supplemental Baptism" or "Supplemental Marriage"? The argument seems to mean that the oftener a man is ordained the better! For me Episcopal Ordination is Ordination, and it cannot be supplemental'. I do not myself see how this can be answered. There is one point, indeed, where Father Hebert seems at first to yield some ground. He allows that Christ did not institute episcopacy and that in the New Testament 'presbyters' and 'bishops' are two names for one type of minister — in other words, he admits that here scholarship has decided in favour of the Free Church claim. But he adds that this only means that in the crucial passages all the presbyters were bishops, and he makes a distinction between 'Essential' and 'Dependent Ministries' in the New Testament, which he tells us is to be developed in a volume that the Bishop of Oxford is editing. It seems plain that between him and Mr. Thompson there is a dead-lock. It does not follow that there will be one in South India, for it is not likely that, if the Scheme 'goes through', the Anglo-Catholics will secede from the Anglican Church. Whether they would do so if a similar scheme were adopted, for instance, in South Africa, where they are far more numerous than in South India — or in England itself — who can say? It seems certain that the Anglican Church would rather reject any scheme than face a new schism — and, at any rate from their own point of view, are they not right? For the sake of clearness it may be worth while to state the present problem, for it is not the same as the problem of our fathers. It runs something like this — 'Is the difference between those who think that episcopacy is *de jure divino* and those who think it is *de jure humano* so fundamental that the question cannot be left open in a new church?' For myself I would like to agree with Mr. Thompson against Father Hebert, but I cannot yet confidently say that I do. There is no space here to develop the reasons for such hesitation.

In a regular review of Father Hebert's book much would need to be said of his attempt to re-introduce the term 'form' in theology. He uses it in much the same way as Aquinas, who, of course, borrowed it from Aristotle and 'christianized' it. It is quite likely that it has come to stay, for there does not seem to be any adequate alternative, but it does not help at all with the problems of re-union. None the less every serious student of theology should examine Father Hebert's use of the term. There are many other excellences in his book — for instance, his constant reference to the doctrine of the Holy Spirit in the Church, his very able exposition of the

meaning of 'catholicity', and the way in which he always starts from Christ. There is a very great deal in his book that is of value for all Christians, and its temper is altogether admirable.

C. RYDER SMITH

### THE COSMIC CROSS

THE Cross has ever been 'dark with excess of light', the 'light' of the infinite, redeeming Love of God, 'which, like a fire, is always burning in His heart'. That He 'so loved the world that He gave His only begotten Son, that, whosoever believeth on Him, should not perish, but have eternal life', is so utterly incredible that it must be true.

It will be noted that in even this short summary of the Gospel of Grace the terms 'the world', and 'whosoever' and 'eternal life' are cosmic and a careful reading of the New Testament discovers many other references to a Cross that is universal and age-long. In their continual attempts to understand and interpret the Atonement, scholars have consciously availed themselves of the new knowledge of their age, and unconsciously responded to the *Zeitgeist*, the spirit of their time.

Thus it was inevitable that St. Paul, 'a Hebrew of Hebrews', living in the middle of the first century and trained in the Rabbinical school, should try to express the truth in the ideology and the phraseology of Jewish legalism and ritualism. It was equally natural that the author of the Fourth Gospel, writing towards the end of the first century or in the early years of the second, should conceive the Person and the Work of Christ in the language of Greek philosophy.

In the mercy of God, Saul the nationalist became Paul the universalist, declaring constantly that 'Christ died for ALL'. In a deeper, and even in a wider sense, the Apostle to the Gentiles gained a vision of the Cross as cosmic. His sensitiveness to the age-long agony of the universe — 'the whole creation groaning and travailling in pain' — was soothed by his perception of the purpose of it all, 'the end to which the whole creation moves', viz. 'the revealing of the sons of God', with the 'hope that the creation itself also shall be delivered from the bondage of corruption into the liberty of the glory of the children of God' (Romans viii, 19-22).

The author of *John*, however, breathed freely the ampler air of Hellenism, and his cosmic vision is clearer. The Prologue to his book is a Providential preparation of the Evangel for its comprehension and acceptance by men of later centuries and even by the modern mind. There the narrow limitations of what we call 'Time' are lost in a *Weltanschauung* which dimly describes the very 'beginning', when The Logos, The Word, was 'with God, and was God'. Then the Logos became active in Time, for 'all things were made by Him', and 'in Him was life, and the life was the light of men', 'the true light which lighteth every man, coming into the world'. (John i, 1-9).

There is, indeed, no direct reference to the Cross in this passage, yet the idea is implicit, for the Work of Christ, in His life and in His death, in Time and in Eternity, is one.

If 'The Revelation' came from the same pen as the Fourth Gospel, the phrase 'The Lamb that hath been slain FROM THE FOUNDATION OF THE WORLD' (xiii, 8), gains a deeper significance as the utterance of one whose outlook was as wide and far as that of the Prologue.

But is there any trace of such a conception of the Cross as cosmic in the recorded words of Jesus? A clear indication of it is found, surely, in His saying concerning the 'grain of wheat' which must 'fall into the earth, and die' in order to fulfil its purpose; especially if the saying be interpreted, as it ought to be, of course, in the

light of its context. 'Certain Greeks', proselytes, pilgrims to Jerusalem for the Feast of the Passover, wishing to 'see Jesus', were brought to Him by Andrew and Philip. At sight of them, the first-fruit of the Gentiles, our Lord was strangely moved in spirit. 'The hour is come', He cried, 'that the Son of Man' — not 'The son of David' nor 'The son of Abraham', but 'The Son of MAN' — 'should be glorified'.

But He added immediately, 'Verily, verily, I say unto you, Except a grain of wheat fall into the earth and die, it abideth by itself alone; but, if it die, it beareth much fruit. He that loveth his life loseth it; and he that hateth his life in this world shall keep it unto life eternal. If any man serve Me, let him follow Me: and, where I am, there shall My Servant be; if any man serve Me, him will My Father honour. 'Now is My soul troubled, and what shall I say? Father, save Me from this hour? But for this cause came I unto this hour. Father, glorify Thy name' (John xii, 20-27).

Dr. McClymont's comment on this incident makes clear the meaning. 'In this approach of the Greeks . . . Jesus sees an earnest of the sovereignty which He is to exercise over the Gentile world; and this again reminds Him of the cross on which He is to find a throne . . . In His reply Jesus sets forth the great law of His Kingdom, which was about to find its highest fulfilment in His own Person — the law of life through death' ('The Century Bible').

Now, if Christ's 'Kingdom' includes, as surely it does, all domains, then 'the law of life through death', now known as the Law of Vicarious Sacrifice, must be universal. It operates in Nature, as in the case of the 'grain of wheat'; it operates also in Human Nature, as in the instance of the 'hated' and 'kept' life. In one word, the Law is cosmic, and our Lord Himself links it closely with His own sacrificial death on the Cross.

No intelligent person dreams of reading the Old Testament or the New for the purpose of gaining scientific knowledge, yet some of the recorded sayings of the Master and some of the dictated sentences of Paul do contain biological terms, and even formulate biological rules, and are anticipations of modern science.

And it might prove, in an age predominantly scientific, such as this, that the presentation of the Cross in the language and the ideology of science would arrest and convince the minds of those to whom its formulation in forensic and ritualistic terms makes no appeal.

Ever since Professor Drummond, in 1899, led the revolt against the Darwinian and Huxleyan description of Nature as 'red in tooth and claw with ravine', a long succession of scientists has demonstrated more and more fully and clearly the pre-eminent part of the work of the Law of Vicarious Sacrifice in the preservation and the development of life in the world.

The death of Jesus on the Cross remains 'a deep where all our thoughts are drowned', yet the modern mind will credit the tremendous truth the more readily if it be represented, not as a strangely solitary and mysterious event, unrelated to all else, but rather as the climax and the consummation of a process which is universal and eternal.

This view of the Cross does not change in the least the fact of the 'exceeding sinfulness' of sin, nor does it lessen in any degree man's need of salvation and of a Saviour. But it does relate the Cross to the creative, as well as to the re-creative Work of the Logos, and unifies the purpose of God's Grace.

If, in his reaction from Darwin's sombre conception, Drummond over-estimated the value of what he called 'The missing factor in current theories of evolution', viz., 'The struggle-for-the-life-of-others', biologist after biologist since his day has confirmed his claim of the vital importance of this 'factor' in the continuance and the advance of life.

Pain is recognized now as an experience which is beneficial, if not essential, to the



welfare of man. Its place in the scheme of things is known to be smaller than once it was thought to be: yet the scientist of to-day sees quite clearly the connection between sacrifice and service.

Sir James Y. Simpson may be regarded as representative of this school of thought, and a relevant passage from his book, *The Spiritual Interpretation of Nature*, may be quoted at length in vindication of its point of view. It is taken from the chapter on 'Natural Selection'. He wrote: 'When we have estimated the charges of cruelty against Nature, have realized the price of progress, and considered the place of altruism, we may return to ponder on the fundamental place of suffering and service in the world. For they have been there from the beginning, curiously connected, no mere capricious incident, but part of the very pattern of the web of life.'

'As Creation is an organic whole, every part is in the service of some other. The plant world is in the employ of the herbivorous section of the animal world; it does it service. But in the course of time appear the carnivorous groups: the herbivorous forms come into their employ: the altar of sacrifice is raised: and since that day its stones have never been cast down. Suffering and service are wrought into the process. Our more abundant human life is the outcome of the travail of creation's lower forms. Whatever we have in national or social or individual life that is at all worth having has been purchased at the price of blood. . . And when, in more mystic mood, we consider this suffering and service in the light of the Crucifixion, they seem to glow with an added lustre. Suffering itself is service, and vicarious suffering its highest expression. The principle of vicarious sacrifice pervades creation, and is most marvellously productive of service in others. At Calvary the Creator draws men to Himself by His submission to this one great law of sacrifice.'

The Cross, then, is not an accident, nor even a mere incident, a crime that happened to be committed some nineteen hundred years ago. Nor is it an afterthought of God, a belated attempt to put right a scheme which had somehow gone wrong. To God, 'Time is an 'Everlasting Now'. He sees the end from the beginning. The Cross is part of His eternal purpose of Love, the perfect fulfilment of the principle on the operation of which all life depends, the Law of Vicarious Sacrifice. For this reason the very foundation of the universe is cruciform.

The biologist is not alone 'among the prophets'. The anthropologist, the psychologist, the annalist, the journalist are also, consciously or unconsciously, of that 'goodly fellowship', bearing witness continually to the prevalence and the power of Vicarious Sacrifice; for Human Nature, in addition to Nature, is revealing daily the potency of Other-Love.

Here maternity becomes motherhood, with its almost unlimited capacity for self-giving; here instinct is sublimated into volition. Men and women willingly 'lay down' their lives for causes, comrades, strangers, even 'enemies'.

Surely it is reasonable to interpret the life and the death of Jesus in the light of what is best in Human Nature? He Himself did this. 'Which of you that is a father?' 'Either what woman?' 'If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children, how much more shall your Heavenly Father?' He was wont to ask. The best in Human Nature is the Love which gives and serves, suffers and sacrifices. The Holy Rood reveals THAT, in perfection, in infinity, in the very 'Heart of the Eternal'.

In an age, of which the dominant moral mood is sacrificial, as markedly as its dominant mental mood is scientific, might not the Cross win the minds and the hearts of men more swiftly and surely, if it were shown to them as the climax of a process of suffering Love which is cosmic? Then and thus would the prediction of Jesus be fulfilled, 'And I, if I be lifted up from the earth, will draw all men unto Myself'.

H. WILSON

## THE INDIAN CHURCH AND POLITICS

INDIA is a land about which generalizations are particularly dangerous. It is as large as Europe, without Russia, and more complex and varied in its peoples; statements made about one area may be wholly untrue about another. Yet there are certain facts about the Christian Church and the political situation which have emerged in the tragic history of latter years and which are accepted as being applicable in a general sense throughout the land. It is well for us to consider them in this country, and especially within the confines of the Christian Church, whose calling it is to exercise a ministry of reconciliation. The need for such a ministry is urgent. Suspicion, distrust, resentment and a sense of frustration have reached a level in India's regard of Britain never equalled in the history of our relationships, though a severely censored press gives but small hint of it; some of these feelings have already begun to seep into the mind of the Indian Church. What has already happened in the way of correspondence between the Church in Britain and the Church in India should be more widely understood than seems to be the case at present, and the step needs to be most earnestly considered; the ball appears to be in our court. Three things need to be remembered.

(1) The first is that the majority of Christians in India are not yet politically educated; many outcaste Christians in rural India have no equipment to form a political judgment. But they are being reached. 'The Indian Christian community', writes a missionary from such an area, 'is beginning to wake up to its own responsibility in the political sphere and is busy organizing itself.'

(2) The next point, to remember is that the educated and politically-minded section of the Indian Church is nationalist to the core, as we should expect and indeed desire it to be, in the sense that it seeks freedom for India to take her place amongst the great peoples of the world.

(3) Thirdly, the means through which the Indian Church can express her judgment are (a) The National Christian Council comprising all the non-Roman Churches and (b) The All India Council of Indian Christians, a body which seeks to express Christian judgments on social and political issues. Its President is Sir Raja Maharaj Singh.

What then has the Indian Church to say on the political deadlock? The question can be answered within the limits imposed by the first of these considerations. Last year the India Committee of the Conference of Missionary Societies sent a lengthy letter to the N.C.C. of India expressing the keen sense of concern among many British Christians on the political situation and the desire to co-operate with the N.C.C. in the fundamental task of reconciliation for which the Church, both in India and England, has a unique responsibility. The letter tried to interpret the general attitude of British Christians to Indian political events and asked the N.C.C. to advise the India Committee as to how the Churches in Britain could best serve in the common task of increasing mutual understanding and goodwill between the two countries. About the same time the British Council of Churches sent a brief message of goodwill to the N.C.C., with which the President, the Archbishop of Canterbury, enclosed a short personal covering letter. All these communications received wide publicity in India; they were carefully considered and the longer one from the India Committee was officially answered in detail. Dr. R. B. Manikam, the N.C.C. Secretary, sent a covering letter in which he said: 'This reply was drafted after much thought and deliberation by the Indian members of the National Christian Council. Then the reply was placed before the Council meeting at one of its plenary sessions. Since the membership of the Council includes not only Indians and Britishers, but also Americans and Continentals, the Council as a whole was not asked to endorse

the reply, but it gladly agreed to forward the reply as it came with the unanimous consent of the Indian members of the Council.'

The letter runs as follows:

'We deeply appreciate the spirit which permeates your cordial letter which has brought us assurance of your oneness with us in Christ. We give thanks to God for the spiritual bonds which unite us as Christians in both countries, and we would take this opportunity of conveying our deep gratitude to the Churches in Great Britain and other countries in the West for all that their fellowship has meant to us, both as a Church and as a country. We have been greatly moved by your sympathy and by your desire to understand the Indian situation. We share your anxiety and will try to interpret to you as well as we can the mind of the Indian Church. We need hardly say that the bulk of our community consists of rural Christians who, with us, are deeply appreciative of what the preaching of the Gospel has wrought in their midst through the ministry of Christian missions and Churches from the West. The issues raised by you have, however, been exercising the minds of many Indian Christians in this country, and we are thankful that bodies of intelligent opinion have also been facing these questions in Britain. In response to your request we are sharing with you in love and candour our thoughts on the Indian situation as we see it.

1. Educated Indian Christians fully share the national aspirations of their countrymen. Consequently they also share the sorrow and disappointment aroused by the present political deadness. A terrible sense of resentment and frustration prevails throughout the land.

2. The resolving of this deadlock should be the immediate concern of all Christian forces in India and Great Britain. We suggest, therefore, with a full sense of responsibility, the following steps:

(a) The first requisite for a calmer atmosphere is the unconditional release of the interned political leaders so that they can get together with other leaders to form a national Government. We consider it the duty of the Government to provide all necessary assistance towards this end.

(b) We feel that the Cripps offer should have been modified to meet the demands of Indian political opinion for the immediate formation of a national Government during the period of war instead of being hastily withdrawn. Nevertheless, in our opinion, the acceptance of the Cripps offer might have been wise.

(c) The declaration of the Cripps proposals in a more acceptable form should be made simultaneously with the release of the leaders. Steps should then be taken to inaugurate in India national and fully representative Governments, at the centre and in the provinces.

(d) A clear and unequivocal declaration should be made that the Atlantic Charter does apply to India and that the British Government intends to give effect to its provisions.

3. Though the problems of minorities is international, we are deeply conscious of the grievous nature of communal differences in Indian life. We are glad to note that your sympathies are whole-heartedly with us in our desire to see a united and free India in which the right of social, cultural and religious minorities will be secured. These rights, we believe, ought to be mutually guaranteed by the communities and not safeguarded by an external authority. We believe that such guarantee will be forthcoming when the leaders of all communities work together and share the responsibilities of office.

4. It is our earnest prayer that such a lead should come as soon as possible from Great Britain. We, therefore, appeal to the Churches in Great Britain to do all they can to bring about such a change in the political atmosphere. This, we believe, is the

ministry of reconciliation which is the clear duty of the Church, to which you in Britain and we in India are called.'

Did space allow, further similar illuminating quotations could be given from (1) the All-India Council of India Christians which also replied to the letter of the India Committee, (2) the Hyderabad-Secunderabad Christian Conference, a branch of the all-India Council whose Chairman is a Methodist Missionary, Rev. H. W. Sibree Page, and (3) a statement by twenty-five British Missionaries in India, belonging to various branches of the Christian Church, including six influential Methodists, the Bishop of Madras, and the Metropolitan Bishop of Calcutta. All these statements agree in pressing for (a) the release of those who are imprisoned without charge and therefore without trial, and (b) the summoning by the Government of a representative Conference.

The unanimity of these appeals was such that the India Committee and the British Council of Churches agreed to form a deputation to wait on Mr. Amery and to acquaint him with what had transpired in the course of correspondence with the Indian Church. Archbishop Temple headed the delegation which Mr. Amery received with his usual courtesy. He also gave his usual reply — with which the country has now become familiar — demanding penitence and recantation on India's part before any such requests as those mentioned above can be considered. There the matter now rests. Meanwhile the gulf widens. It has given satisfaction to Indian Christians that this last step was taken by the British Council of Churches; but it has so far borne no visible fruit. Ought British Christians to be content to let the matter rest there?

One further word may be added. Nearly two years ago Rev. Norman Goodall, now secretary of the International Missionary Council, in his booklet *The Indian Deadlock*, made a moving appeal to the Prime Minister in the following terms, 'As a minister of the Word appealing to a master of words I would beg the Prime Minister to use his unrivalled authority in interpreting to India the urgent concern of this country that in unity and freedom the people of India may enter into a new and happier day.' That appeal has elicited no response, but it still holds. Mr. Churchill could, if he would, speak such a creative and redeeming 'word' to India at this time as would drastically and dramatically transform the whole atmosphere of the present tragic situation; it might not in itself solve the problem, but it would create a new relationship between Britain and India in which a solution would more easily be found.

G. E. HICKMAN JOHNSON

### CHARLES PÉGUY

CHARLES PÉGUY belongs to the class of men who become great in comparative obscurity; their greatness only recognized by a sensitive few. Ann and Julian Green by their book *Charles Péguy — Basic Verities* (Kegan Paul) should be instrumental in widening the circle of his admirers. That he was not entirely without them is evinced by the prophecy, for instance, of Emmanuel Mounier: 'The day will come, and it is close at hand, when one of our greatest poets and a prophetic thinker will be recognized at his true value.' Henri Bergson has testified to his marvellous gift of stepping beyond the materiality of beings, going beyond it and penetrating to the soul. George N. Shuster finds it difficult to express all he had learned to love in him, 'the tireless searcher to whom more than a few will be in debt for evermore'.

He was born on January 7th, 1873, at Orleans, the town where Joan of Arc had rallied the forces of France. The spirit of this French patriot and saint seems to have

hovered over the whole of his life. Was she the spring of his strong patriotism and the source of his later religious intensity? Péguy was born into a peasant home. His father died when he was a babe and his mother made a hard living by mending chairs. The chairs and the hard living associated with them were woven into the texture of his life. Though later he lived much in Paris he never became a Parisian; he was always the peasant. For him the peasants of France were the true France.

In school and college he commanded respect and wielded unusual power. To him fellow students turned instinctively for guidance; when he spoke there was immediate silence, and his pronouncements were rarely questioned. He had brown, masterful eyes which flashed when ideas came to him. His delicately formed hands could crush yours in their powerful grasp. He was austere in his living, eschewing popular evils. Many of the characteristics which were dominant in his maturer years may be seen budding in his youth. The destitute were for him a life-long concern. When at school he drew money from his fellow students to feed the hungry. The vision of the City of the Future, with him to the end, is seen alight in his youth. Secretly when at college he wrote his manuscript on Joan of Arc. He never tired of writing about her. His passion for justice showed itself early in his leadership of the opposition to the condemnation of Dreyfus. With words and more tangible weapons he strenuously fought. When sitting for examinations he would read through the paper, sleep for half an hour, then quickly and confidently write whatever came into his head. Later he contended that what entered the mind was 'dictated' and should be written or spoken. His later religious intensity was not foreshadowed in the atheism of his first thirty years; but his practical love for the needy maybe was a prelude to it.

Having spent some years as a student, he failed in his final examinations at the Ecole National Supérieure, set aside the idea of a university career and eventually gave himself to socialism, bookselling, publishing and writing.

Socialism for him meant the temporal salvation of humanity by the purification of the working world, and the regaining of the dignity of work. This would lead to the purification of the economic and industrial world. He contended that the immediate problem was 'the tearing of the destitute from their destitution'. Equality was secondary. It mattered little to him who shared the luxuries but it was of primary importance that everyone should have the necessities. 'His Socialism was far more akin to the socialism of St. Francis than that of Karl Marx.'

The socialist bookshop which he opened attracted many who came to discuss, but few who came to buy. With many other books, his dramatic play of Joan of Arc lay unsold. Excitement reigned when the first copy was sold. Financially he was always in difficulties. The books he published were largely written by himself and his friends. They were not in the popular style and attracted small notice. But he established a reputation for unsullied publishing perfection. There was never a misprint in a book he published; when he corrected a book it was corrected.

He wrote in both prose and poetry on a variety of subjects. At least three characteristics are common to both, simplicity, trenchancy, repetition. His repetition is almost irritating, yet it is creative of a power of appeal. 'He has the hypnotic force of an incantation.' The man himself is plainly revealed in so much that he writes. He had a strong strain of daring honesty. 'Woe to the lukewarm. Shame on him who is ashamed. . . . The question concerns the man who would sell his God to avoid being ridiculous. This is the man whose look, beforehand, begs pardon for God; in drawing-rooms.' 'He who does not bellow the truth when he knows the truth makes himself the accomplice of liars and forgers.' His word on the brave man suggests a penetrating mind 'A brave man — and so far there are not many — for the sake of truth breaks with his friends and his interests. Thus a new party is formed and supposedly the party of justice and truth, which in less than no time becomes absolutely identical



with the other parties. A party like the others; like all the others; as vulgar; as gross; as unjust; as false. Then for this second time, a superbrave man would have to be found to make a second break; but of these there are hardly any left.' His serious conception of work leads him to look back with wistful longing to the days when 'the bygone workman did not serve, he worked. It wasn't that the chair rung had to be made well for a salary, for the master or the client. It had to be well made itself, in itself, for itself, in its very self.' His love of freedom is seen in his belief that 'school teachers should not be representatives of the government, but of humanity, of poets and artists, of philosophers and scholars, of the men who have made and maintained humanity.' The modern world for him is a world of those who have no mysticism.

He acknowledged to a friend in 1908 that he had become a Christian, though he was always in difficulty with the subject of forgiveness. His marriage was not recognized by the Roman Catholic Church and his children were not baptized. He never became a member of the Church but he could be seen counting his beads and saying his prayers as he walked, with tears running down his cheeks. He bemoaned the lack of charity in the Church. 'All the weakness of the Church in the modern world comes from the fact that what remains of the Christian world socially, is profoundly lacking in charity'. 'The intellectual attitudes would have had short shrift if Christianity had remained what it was, a communion, a religion of the heart.' So now 'Our faiths are citadels. The least among us is a soldier. The flood of infidelity holds the seas and continuously assails us from all sides. All our houses are fortresses in peril of the sea. The holy war is everywhere.' For him the recognition of sin is the first attribute of a Christian. 'What is most contrary to salvation is not sin but habit.'

For his poetry he will probably be remembered longest. 'The Mystery of the Charity of Joan of Arc', 'The Porch of the Mystery of the Second Virtue', 'The Mystery of the Holy Innocents' and 'Eve' are his best poems. There is a profound simplicity in his style. The workman or peasant could easily understand his words. 'Péguy shared with Dante the peculiar gift of clothing the metaphysical with humanity.' Rather extensively he uses God as speaker. He does it with reverence and striking effect. It is 'a God who talks like an elderly French peasant well versed in his catechism.' God is sorry that man will not abandon himself to Him: 'A little confidence, don't you know, a little relaxation. A little yielding, a little abandonment into my arms. He is always so stiff.' Of Christ God says 'Our Father who art in heaven, my son taught them that prayer . . . He knew very well what he was doing that day . . . every prayer comes to Me hidden behind those three or four words.' God's word about Frenchmen is a reflection of the intense patriotism of Péguy. 'Our Frenchmen — They are My favourite witnesses.' The final word of God on Freedom has a beauty all its own. 'All the prostrations in the world are not worth the beautiful upright attitude of a free man as he kneels. All the submission, all the dejection in the world, are not equal in value to the soaring up point, the beautiful straight soaring up of one single invocation from a love that is free.' Péguy has an outstanding gift in the use of repetition. In his hands it takes to itself beauty, music and force. Each repetition is slightly different and makes its own contribution, though small, to the enrichment of the whole.

Péguy was a lover. He loved France, the destitute, justice, children, God. And he loved words: 'Ah, les mots, mon vieux, les mots.' He loved good work. In all he did he was intense, serious, exacting. Shoddy thought or work were beyond him. He was an egoist, losing friends in later years because they dared to differ from him. He was courageous, forthright, uncompromising. But always he was the peasant and 'in him the deep silent France of the Provinces has found a voice'.

He died in September 1914 fighting for the France he loved. He died because he stood up when others lay down. He had not studied the art of taking shelter. He

need not have been in the danger zone, but that was his natural place when injustice called. He died striving to lead his men forward. So had he lived, urging men on to his City of the Future, when bad men would be turned into good men, the world of work would be purified, when justice would reign and the destitute no longer be known. But he could not believe in forgiveness!

H. WHITTAKER

## *Editorial Comments*

### THE LATE ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY

It was my great privilege to meet Dr. Temple on many occasions when questions of national and ecclesiastical policy were under consideration. At such times one was conscious of his clear vision, his balanced judgment and his courageous leadership. In more intimate contact one discovered in him one of those rare souls who would 'brother all mankind'. His sudden passing at the height of his power is a sore loss to every section of the community, for his sympathies and his service were not bounded by caste, by colour, or by creed. He knew the ways and the speech of ordinary men and gave his life that their needs might be supplied. Every branch of the Christian Church will mourn his death, and honour his memory.

To a little group of men met in a quiet room in the heart of battered London he came, one day, at his own suggestion. He was more than usually pressed by engagements that week, but having heard of the existence of this quite unofficial circle of friends, he decided he would like to meet them. They included a bishop, three Anglican clergy, two Congregationalists, a Baptist and a Methodist. For nearly three hours Dr. Temple talked with them of the South India scheme, of experiments in complementary and supplementary ordination, of the arrangement between Presbyterians and Anglicans in Persia and of the importance attached to the sacrament of Holy Communion by members of the Church of England and of the Free Churches. It was an unforgettable experience. There was no attempt to deliver an oration or to stress any dogmatic interpretation; it was rather a conversation amongst friends, but a conversation in which one man by his tremendous sincerity and courage strove to discover a solution which would strengthen the whole Church of Christ.

There are other memories which come back — memories of more spectacular and dramatic intensity. One can see the late Archbishop leading a procession of Christian witness at Whitsuntide, 1943, in the solemn splendour of Westminster Abbey. More than two hundred and fifty clergy representing world-wide Protestant Christianity followed Dr. Temple in a simple but definite confession of faith. Then all knelt with the great throng of people, the Primate in their midst to repeat the Lord's Prayer, each man in the tongue wherein he was born. In contrast one sees him mirthful and happy amongst friends of many varieties of churchmanship, relaxed a little after a vigorous crusading for social justice and the application of Christian principles to everyday life. Philosopher, statesman, born leader of men — William Temple will not be forgotten by his contemporaries, nor will the writers of to-morrow be able to omit his name from the pages which shall tell the story of this troubled age. The problems to which he gave his life were the problems which are facing the post-war world, and his leadership marked out many broad paths which would lead to their solution.

In time to come men may speak of him as a great Archbishop, but those who knew him and honoured him for his amazing gifts, will remember him not only for his

fearless advocacy and his constructive statesmanship, but for the intimacy and understanding which characterized his friendship.

### A WORLD AT PRAYER

It is an impressive fact that for nearly a century the first week of the Christian New Year has been observed as a week of prayer. Neither the stress of war nor the indolence which has sometimes characterized the world's uneasy peace has broken the continuity of this observance. The custom has spread far and wide until the whole world may be said to have its representatives joining together in a great united act of intercession. The world's Evangelical Alliance has been responsible for what organization was necessary to co-ordinate these countless prayer-meetings. To-day it is a remarkable fact that north, south, east and west, irrespective of colour or language or political ideologies, people will gather — it may be in great companies, it may be in twos and threes — to pray for one another and for all mankind. Even where the Gestapo has shackled and muzzled the Christian ministry there will be brave Christian people, men and women, who will be praying together in this dedicated week. In the deepest sense it would be true to say that war has strengthened the unity of the Church whilst it has caused so many human institutions to disintegrate. In some cases there is reason to believe that young Christian churches have developed a new and invincible independence during the very time that they were subjected to severe persecution by the enemy who had overrun the land. The history of the last five years will be a revelation to those who talk and write of Christian martyrdom as though it occurred only in the first centuries of the Christian era. In referring to the Universal Week of Prayer last year, Dr. Chirgwin stressed the fact that this world-wide intercession meant not only that the people were praying at the same time but that they were praying for the same thing: 'Try and conjure up in your minds what that means. Take, for example, the Dutch East Indies, now under Japanese control. In those islands there are more Protestant Christians than there are in China and Japan put together. Although most of them have been drawn from primitive tribes, and although many of them had fathers, or at least, grand-fathers who were cannibals, they are now a strong Christian community, building their own churches, paying their own ministers, running their own schools and carrying on their own Christian work. It is impossible to say how they are faring just now, for we have been completely cut off from them for the last twelve months. But I am sure they will remain loyal to their faith, and I am glad to think that their prayers will be joined with ours this week.'

Twelve months have passed. The possibility of the speedy liberation of the Dutch East Indies is becoming more probable every day. The people of Belgium, Greece, France, Yugoslavia are beginning to realize the fullness of deliverance. Never surely in all the hundred years of its continuance has this week of universal prayer been so full of possibility. Perhaps the New World depends upon it more than on political plans or presidential elections.

### NOTE

When these notes appear the Editor will have gone on a journey to the Middle East and to the Central Mediterranean. He has been invited to visit isolated units, to meet Chaplains in conferences, and to advise those who are directing the candidature of men on active service overseas. There are many potential candidates for the ministry and it is felt of the greatest importance that they should know what arrangements are being made for their examination, training and subsequent acceptance. Representatives of the Church of England and the Church of Scotland have gone on similar missions, and the Editor asks for the indulgence of the readers

of this Review. He is deeply grateful to his colleague the Rev. Edgar C. Barton, to Rev. Dr. C. Ryder Smith and to Mr. R. W. Young for their help in making final arrangements for the publication of this issue. He hopes to return to this country in three months.

LESLIE F. CHURCH

## Ministers in Council

**NORTH WESTERN AREA MINISTERIAL ASSOCIATION.** The Rev. H. Wakefield of Liverpool reports that arrangements have now been made for the next sessions of this Association. If circumstances permit, it is hoped to have, as in pre-war days, gatherings from Tuesday to Thursday one week in April. Though not yet fixed, Ramsey may be the rendezvous.

The general theme for discussion will be 'The Kingdom of God'. On the Wednesday morning an essay is to be given by the Rev. J. A. McGain on 'The Kingdom of God in the Teaching of Jesus'. The Rev. Ralph Noble will open the ensuing discussion.

During the Wednesday afternoon an essay will be read by the Rev. L. Duchars on 'The relation of the Church's witness and service to the Kingdom'. The Rev. J. Axson will open a conversation.

On Wednesday night at a public meeting, the Rev. H. Wakefield will speak on 'The Kingdom of God and the Individual' and the Rev. W. R. Basham on 'The Kingdom of God and the Community.'

For the Thursday morning the Rev. Bernard Jones has for his subject 'The poetry of T. S. Eliot'.

The Association sermon is to be preached on the Tuesday evening by the Rev. E. B. Hartley, B.A., B.D., of Halifax.

**REFRESHER COURSE IN DURHAM.** The Rev. A. G. Utton, M.A., B.D., the Chairman of the Sunderland and Durham District, has kindly given me particulars if a Refresher Course recently held in that District.

Taking as the subject of study 'The Distinctive Ideas of the Old Testament', a threefold plan was adopted.

First was set out a course of reading, suggested by Professor Norman H. Snaith, M.A. (Tutor in Old Testament Language and Literature at the Huddersfield College). This was as follows:

(1) 'The Importance of the Idea of God': Read Julian Huxley's *Religion without Revelation*, and also the concluding chapter of his *Evolution: a modern Synthesis*. In addition, those taking the course were asked to consider the general attitude of anthropologists and of writers on Comparative Religion.

(2) 'The Holiness of God': Davidson's *Theology of the Old Testament*, pp. 144-169; Articles on 'Mana' in *Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics*; W. R. Smith's *Religion of the Semites*, third edition, pp. 140-164, 548-555, and Otto's *Idea of the Holy*.

(3) 'The Righteousness of God': Davidson, pp. 129-144, 259-282, 359-401; W. R. Smith, pp. 655-671; Dodd's *The Bible and the Greeks*, pp. 42-59; Sanday and Headlam's *Romans* (I.C.C.), pp. 24-39.

(4) 'The Grace of God': Davidson, pp. 235-289, Dodd, pp. 59-75; Eichrodt, *Theologie des Alten Testaments*, I. And articles on Covenant, Election, etc., in E.R.E. and in the Dictionaries of the Bible.

(5) 'The Love of God': Davidson, pp. 169-181, with Nygren's *Agape and Eros*, Part II (translated by P. S. Watson), vols. 1 and 2 (S.P.C.K.).

(6) 'The Spirit of God'; Davidson, pp. 115-128: *The doctrine of the Holy Spirit* (Epworth Press), first essay; Volz *Der Geist Gottes*.

Readers are also recommended to consult throughout the relevant articles in *E.R.E.*, Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible*, and, with caution, in the *Encyclopedia Biblica*. A circular letter was sent out in October last with the above plan of study.

Then, secondly, came two days of meetings for preparatory study and conference, namely, on November 26th and on February 18th from 10 to 12 and 2 to 4 on each of these days.

The third and culminating part of the scheme was a period of three days in March last with study and discussion under the personal direction of Mr. Snaith. These meetings, held on March 28th, 29th and 30th, were in Bishop Cosin's Library, Palace Green, Durham, by kind permission of the Durham College. A picnic lunch was taken each day in the schoolroom of the Elvet Church. The only expenses falling on the brethren were for travelling, and these were pooled.

Much appreciation was expressed by those who attended the meetings and warm thanks were due to Mr. Utton and Mr. Snaith for the organization, direction and lecturing.

Since this Refresher Course, Professor Snaith has published the Fernley-Hartley Lecture on *The Distinctive Ideas of The Old Testament* (Epworth Press, 10s.) into which the above scheme of study would now fit admirably for other groups.

**LINCOLN DISTRICT REFRESHER COURSE.** An autumn Refresher Course for ministers in the Lincoln and Grimsby District was held from Wednesday evening to Saturday morning, October 11th-14th, in the Bishop's Hostel, Lincoln, by kind permission of the Warden, Canon Eric Abbott, M.A.

The programme of lectures was an appetizing one. Professor Atkinson Lee, M.A. (Hartley College), gave a series on 'Church, State and Community'. The Rev. N. H. Snaith, M.A., gave three talks on 'Righteousness'; 'Evolution and Original Sin'; and 'Conversion'. From the Rev. E. Gordon Rupp, M.A. (of Chislehurst) came lectures on 'The Future of the English Protestant Tradition'. Dr. S. G. Dimond (secretary of the Ministerial Training Committee) spoke on 'The Commission on Ministerial Training' and also on 'Our Task and our Resources'. The present writer indicated 'Some Present Trends in Methodism'. These lectures were all given in the library of the hostel.

Prayers morning and evening were in the College Chapel and there also Canon Abbott gave a devotional address on 'Prayer and the Ministry'.

After supper and prayers each night, all gathered in the Common Room where conversation was animated and free on many topics. The talk there on the last night will long be remembered for its sounding of the depths.

Each afternoon was left free. On one of them the Chancellor of the Cathedral, Canon Srawley, was good enough to conduct the party round the Cathedral, giving a most interesting description of some of its salient and most outstanding features.

The Course at the Hostel furnished opportunity for full catering for all meals in the dining hall, and for sleeping accommodation. To be able to live under one roof in this way for the whole time was a great boon and added immensely to the pleasure and profit of the fellowship.

Arrangements were in the excellent hands of the Rev. A. H. Clulow, B.A., B.D., of Grimsby. Including some living in the city who joined us, there were thirty-two who attended the Course.



The closing gathering at the Lord's Table in the College Chapel on the Saturday morning was a rich means of grace and a most worthy ending.

**THE MINISTRY OF INTERCESSION.** In a searching address by Canon Abbott of Lincoln in the Refresher Course above referred to, stress was laid on the minister's activity of prayer. Thinking is action, speaking is action, but also, praying is action and action of the highest type and most Christlike.

In *Foothold of Faith* (Dacre Press, 1s. 6d.), by Canon Abbott, the germ of some part of his address is briefly presented, as when writing of the Praying Christ, it is pointed out that His prayer has three aspects, first on earth, as when He could say 'I have prayed for thee, that thy faith fail not'; second, in heaven, as when it is recorded, 'He ever liveth to make intercession', and thirdly, in and through His disciples, members of His body. This last aspect of Christ's prayer has been termed the prayer of the total Christ.

A minister's prayer is not merely the emulation of a Christ external to him but it is the prayer which Christ Himself offers within the soul that loves Him and seeks to serve Him. So then, 'let the heart-beat of His eternal intercession pulsate in your soul, let the web of the divine grace of intercession cover the world, let intercession be your state as well as your word and deed, let the great action of intercession, the spiritual work of meditation, go forward to the greater glory of God.'

'A TESTAMENT OF DEVOTION'. It is good to be reminded from time to time that in Protestant literature are rich treasures of the devotional life and that the springs are not yet by any means dried up. Thomas R. Kelley's *A Testament of Devotion* (Hodder, 3s.) will stimulate the religious life in any thoughtful reader. The short biographical sketch reveals the writer as an American member of the Society of Friends. Philosophy, social service and travel appealed to him but the mystic life was the greatest of all realities to him. Professor Rufus Jones of Haverford College relates how T. R. Kelley came to him as a student and visiting him in the home said suddenly, his face lighted up with radiance, 'I am just going to make my life a miracle'. And certainly an amazing career is set before us by the biographer. He knew both West and East. He worked among German prisoners of war in England from June 1917 to February 1918. In 1925 he gave himself for fifteen months to the German Quakers in Berlin. During the summer of 1938 he made a religious journey in Germany among the Quakers and others of all classes. On this last visit he had an experience in the cathedral at Cologne where he seemed to feel God laying the whole congealed suffering of humanity upon his heart. In 1935 a long standing concern for the East drew him to an appointment at the University of Hawaii. The opportunity to associate with Chinese and Japanese scholars and the teaching of a course in Indian philosophy and a second in Chinese philosophy stirred up great enthusiasm in him.

Gerald Heard, who had never met Thomas Kelley but who had been moved by his devotional writings, wrote when the news of Kelley's death came, 'I was filled with a kind of joy when I read of Thomas Kelley. It was formerly the custom of the Winston Salem Community of Moravians in North Carolina to announce the passing of a member by the playing of three chorales by the church band from the top of the church tower. So I feel I want to sing. . . .'

Five devotional addresses are printed in this little book. The titles are 'The Light Within', 'Holy Obedience', 'The Blessed Community', 'The Eternal Now and Social Concern' and 'The Simplification of Life'. In the latter he pleads for a life that is freed from strain and anxiety and hurry, when something of the Cosmic Patience of God becomes ours. 'I find', he writes, 'He never guides us into an intolerable scramble of panting feverishness. The Cosmic Patience becomes, in part, our patience, for

after all, God is at work in the world. It is not we alone who are at work in the world, frantically finishing a work to be offered to God. Life from the Centre is a life of unhurried peace and power'.

The diction of these chapters may not be ours but the impact is that of a true man of God able to initiate into the secrets of the Highest.

W. E. FARNDALE

## Recent Literature

*The Divine Human Encounter.* By Emil Brunner. (S.C.M. 8s. 6d.)

In this volume the author is concerned with the Biblical conception of truth. He is convinced that the Church, in its interpretation of the Gospel, has gone astray because it has employed the 'subject-object' antithesis which originated in Greek philosophy but is entirely foreign to the content of the Biblical Message. The story of revelation as found in the Bible deals with the relation of God to man and of man to God. It has no doctrine of God as He is in Himself nor of man as he is in himself. It speaks of the 'God Who approaches man and of man as the man who comes from God'. In the Incarnate Son of God the God Who approaches man and the man who comes from God are made manifest. This two-sided relation between God and man is not developed in the Bible as a doctrine, but set forth as an event. It is an encounter in which the initiative is taken by God and it finds expression in 'lordship' and 'fellowship' — that is, we cannot understand the love of God unless we see it as the love of One who wills to be Lord, nor again can we understand God's lordship unless it is related to His will to fellowship or love. In revelation man is confronted by God — by His will to lordship and fellowship — and when man responds, he returns in freedom to God what God first gives to him.

Man's response, described as faith, is an event — a two-sided event. While God comes to meet man, He makes it possible for man to meet Him. In dealing with faith we are not concerned with the relation to an impersonal object. God does not set before us a set of propositions about Himself which we are asked to accept or reject. He communicates *Himself*, and when we appropriate the gift Christian truth comes into being. The Divine-Human encounter is thus the heart of the Gospel and is the theme of preaching, the sacraments and Christian fellowship.

Brunner has once again placed us in his debt by drawing attention to the unique character of Biblical revelation and by reminding us of the permanent significance of Reformation theology. The revelation of God, nevertheless, in Biblical history cannot be isolated from the knowledge of truth gained by philosophic and scientific inquiry. While the latter can never by itself bring us to the centre of the Christian life, it can prepare the way and offer a partial vindication of the tremendous affirmation that in Jesus Christ God meets man and man meets God. 'What God hath joined.'

HAROLD ROBERTS

*Some Hellenistic Elements in Primitive Christianity.* By Wilfred Knox, D.D. (Humphrey Milford. 7s. 6d.)

It was to be expected that there would be some reaction to the recent emphasis upon the Jewish elements in the life of Primitive Christianity. This expectation is fulfilled in the Schweich Lectures of the British Academy, 1942. The ability to undertake this task was manifest in two learned and brilliantly written works which

Canon Knox has already published, *St. Paul and the Church of Jerusalem* (1925) and *St. Paul and the Church of the Gentiles* (1939). The present work is on a much smaller scale, but it displays the same qualities and raises many interesting and important issues. The treatment is limited to the four Gospels, of which the Fourth receives the fullest attention.

Canon Knox explains that his object is to study some of the methods by which the Gospel preached by Jesus in Galilee was converted into a system that could gain a hearing in the civilized world and end by conquering it. In this process, he believes, the hellenization of the Gospel was inevitable. The worship of Jesus goes back to the beginning of Christianity, but in order that the message might be preached to all the world, it had to be translated into the Greek language and accommodated to the general theological conceptions of the hellenistic world. Many before Canon Knox have attempted to show how this was done, but he differs from them in two ways. He does not think that the miraculous element in the New Testament reflects the infiltration of alien ideas into a simple Jewish ethical movement, and he does not believe that there was a complete cleavage between 'hellenistic' Judaism and 'Palestinian' Judaism. The sources of the Gospels, he maintains, are 'redolent of the soil of Palestine'; yet we cannot rule out hellenistic elements from Mark. His illustrations, which include points in Mk. iii. 5f, vii. 21-3, viii. 6, and xiv. 38, are mainly linguistic and stylistic, and do not seem to carry us very far. Much less, he thinks, can be gleaned from the Judaic Gospel of Matthew. If for example, Mt. xi. 25 = Lk. x. 21f. is rejected, it must be on the grounds of our general attitude to the person of Jesus and 'not on the ground that its form or language are "hellenistic" in any intelligible sense' (p. 7). As may be expected the field for inquiry widens considerably in Luke-Acts. But the fullest treatment is given by the author to the Fourth Gospel in Lectures II and III. It is impossible here to summarize his discussion of the Greek elements in this Gospel, and it must be sufficient to say that the reader is on the point of concluding that he is reading the description of a philosophical romance, until on the last page but one Canon Knox explains that he has been dealing with only one of the elements out of which the Fourth Gospel is made up, and that there are two others, the older Christian tradition and Jewish rabbinical theology. 'The greatness of the Gospel lies in the fact that while it interprets the life of Jesus in terms of the theology of the age, it never loses sight of the concrete historical figure of the synoptic tradition or of love as the distinctive quality of Christianity' (p. 89). I hope I have adequately indicated that this stimulating volume is of the first importance to all who make a serious study of the Gospels.

VINCENT TAYLOR

*St. Augustine's Episcopate.* By W. J. Sparrow Simpson. (S.P.C.K. 7s. 6d.)

This is a sequel to the writer's earlier book, *St. Augustine's Conversion*, which appeared fourteen years ago. The present study is described in a sub-title as an introduction to Augustine's writings after he became a Christian, and this accurately indicates the scope of the volume. At the end of some of the chapters there are useful bibliographical notes. The book is written with adequate knowledge, with understanding and with sympathy. The last appears distinctly in the treatment of Augustine's predestinarian doctrine. The real importance of this only appeared many centuries later, when it became Calvinism. For the doctrine of Calvin was simply the doctrine of Augustine, carried out relentlessly by a mind much more logical and much less mystical than that of the great African Father. Much as all good Methodists (and most other Christians to-day) dislike the harsher side of Calvinism we can recognize that it was Augustine's sense of utter helplessness apart from the compelling grace of God that was the real and evangelical source of the doctrinal

error. It lies in the paradox once strikingly expressed by Dr. John Duncan, 'Man must be so shut up that he must come to Christ, and yet know that he cannot. He must come to Christ, or he will look to another — when there is no other to whom he can come; he *cannot* come, or he will look to himself.' The revival of the better side of Calvinism in Barth and his followers is another illustration of Hegel's profound saying that men are nearly always right in what they affirm and nearly always wrong in what they deny.

There are some suggestive paragraphs on personality in the chapter which deals with St. Augustine's treatment of the doctrine of the Trinity, but there is no exposition of two matters which considerably condition the whole discussion. One is the history and use of the word *persona*, in connection with the other Greek and Latin words used in the controversy, and the other is the fact that the whole concept of personality, in anything like the modern sense, was a later development. The vital word *persona* at first suggested rather the character that was sustained than the individual who sustained it, and the other point is sufficiently illustrated by the famous definition of Boethius. The plain fact is that orthodox Trinitarianism, because of these things, has lent itself much more to a popular tendency in the direction of Tritheism than in the opposite direction of Sabellianism. Canon Simpson's book would have been all the better, therefore, for a few pages dealing with the changed meaning of *persona*, and with the slow development of the notion of personality. This, however, is almost our only criticism. We heartily commend the volume, which is well worth reading.

HENRY BETT

*The Thrill of Tradition.* By James Moffatt, D.D. (S.C.M. 7s. 6d.)

*The Free Church Tradition in the Life of England.* By Ernest A. Payne. (S.C.M. 6s.)

The first book is presumably the last we shall have from one of the greatest scholars of our time. It is based upon a series of lectures delivered at the University of Virginia. The volume is marked by the wide learning and the catholic spirit that we expect to find in anything from Dr. Moffatt's pen. Almost the only criticism that suggests itself relates to a characteristic which grew upon the writer in his latter years — a kind of elusiveness. Again and again when we expect a definite judgment, it is evaded, or vaguely suggested rather than plainly stated. Is this a remote influence from Meredith? The place of tradition in relation to the Christian religion is reviewed at many stages and from many angles. Everywhere there is an attractive freshness of outlook, and in almost every page there is something suggestive. The chapter entitled (in a phrase borrowed from Evelyn's *Diary*) 'The New Trent Religion' is particularly illuminating. But one would have welcomed a more thorough examination of the relation between tradition and the 'funded experience' (to use a phrase of Santayana's that Dr. Moffatt quotes) of past generations. We heartily commend the volume, which is well worth careful study.

The second book gives a readable account of the origins and history of the Dissenting churches, and of the part they have played in English life. It is rather overloaded with quotations, many of which are scarcely worth while, but it is quite well written, and manages to condense a great deal of matter into a hundred and fifty pages. There is certainly no book of this size which deals so adequately with the subject, though we could wish that the last thirty years (and particularly the religious results of the years of war) had been treated more fully. The least satisfactory pages in the volume are probably those which refer to Methodism, as often seems to be the case in books of this kind. The names selected as those of the most prominent Methodists, and the books quoted as authorities on our history, will probably strike most of our people as rather a quaint choice.

HENRY BETT

*The Predicament of the Church.* (Lutterworth Press. 8s. 6d.)

This is a useful collection of essays, published originally as far apart as Madras, New York, London, and Cape Town, but all bearing upon the Church's task in the contemporary situation. The volume takes its title from a contribution by Emil Brunner, whose essay is directly pastoral in its intention. He begins by emphasizing the present weakness in fellowship of the local Christian congregations; he goes on to offer reasons for this; and concludes with practical suggestions for ending it. Now, while the Church is weak and ineffective in many places, it is doubtful whether its weakness is generally the one that Brunner speaks of. Dare one say that the Church in the occupied countries failed in fellowship? Or that the typical young British or American Christian 'shows little disposition to become acquainted with his fellow Christians'? It may be that the isolationism which still marks *some* Anglican devotion is rampant in the Churches of Switzerland, of which Prof. Brunner speaks with closest knowledge, but it is certainly not the greatest hindrance we have to the progress of the Gospel in the West. But what makes Brunner's essay of special interest to a Methodist is his proposal to end the predicament by Methodist means! He talks of 'cell-groups' instead of 'Class meetings', but the purpose is the same. One could wish that he knew more of our Methodist policy! One says this because one believes in it. An Anglo-Catholic priest, an enthusiast for the Group Movement, once said 'But of course you Methodists already have all that is best in it.' Similarly, in relation to the training of the Ministry, Brunner's proposals fall far short of what has already been achieved in this country. The Lutheran and Reformed Churches of the Continent have had many able apologists in recent years, and we have profited in this country by their writings. (When are we going to have an attractive Methodist *apologia* to put in *their* hands?) Whether Prof. Brunner's suggestions would prove adequate to stop the rot is more doubtful. Where they are faithfully practised in this country the struggle is still a desperate one.

A second of the essays is by Benedicta Rowe, of the Women's Christian College, Madras. It is entitled *The Disunited Church: Why? and How Long?* It was originally written to help Indian girl students to understand the divisions of the Church in Europe. It is an able and sympathetic study, and is rightly judged to be suitable for a wider public. It would have been even more suitable if it had gone on to speak of the present barriers to Reunion. Apart from the last contribution to the book — a German plea for a Church as 'missionary' at home as it is overseas — the remainder of the essays are sociological. There is an outstanding contribution by two members of the Department of Ethics in the University of Cape Town, A. H. Murray and M. Versfeld, on the 'The Church's Role in Politics.' Alike in diagnosis and in constructive proposals it is persuasive. Professor Murray sees Man reduced by his own thinking to a status that is merely functional, producing what by his own values is no more than 'History without significance'. Dr. Versfeld's response to this appraisal is one of the best things in the book. The Master of Balliol writes on 'Duty to God and State' with his usual ability. Naturally, his essay bears upon our present tensions, and it is almost inevitable that he should have been led to pose the question 'The State demands that we should fight and kill other men . . . How can our duty to God square with this compulsory order?' Perhaps one may say that the predicament of the Church is shown not least in the fact that he never answers that question! He proves the Christian's right to die for his country — but not his right to kill for it. In *Can Christianity and Communism meet?* Fr. Tiran Nersoyan, a priest of an Eastern Church working in London, offers an interesting attempt at a synthesis between the Marxian and the Christian philosophies. It is doubtful if it will satisfy thinkers of either school. One is least happy about the inclusion of F. B. Welbourn's *Christian News-letter* supplement, *Gospel and Law: Punishment of War Criminals*. This is definitely



not an utterance of the ecumenical Church! Reference has been made to Dr. Lindsay's hesitation concerning the Christian as 'killer'. Mr. Welbourn has none! His language would be approved by a Himmler or a Pétain, e.g. 'The Christian will use the gun, the gallows, or the gaol *if the needs of an ordered society* seem to demand them' (italics mine). How much more suitable for this volume would have been Dr. Temple's C.N.-L. supplement *What Christians stand for in the Secular World!*

Enough has been said, I hope, to indicate that this is a book well worth reading. Whether it adequately states the Church's predicament is another matter. It has nothing to say about one of the gravest issues of these days — the deepening hostility of organized labour — nor of the weakness that follows from the Church's attachment to property (and its reluctance to let it go, in order to be where the population is). More important still, it has little to say about Sin. It offers good economic explanations why modern man ignores the Church; it says little of his deliberate rejection of all the Church stands for.

WILFRED WADE

*Freedom in the Faith.* By W. B. Selbie. (Independent Press. 3s. 6d.)

*The Will of God.* By Leslie D. Weatherhead. (Epworth Press. 2s. 6d.)

*Boulevards of Paradise.* By F. W. Boreham. (Epworth Press. 7s. 6d.)

*The Broken Wing.* By Samuel Horton. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

*Sunday at 09.30 Hours.* By Arthur J. Hichens. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

*Do be Practical.* By W. H. Elliott. (Skeffington. 5s.)

To all Christian people who desire and expect to take their part in reconstructing ecclesiastical affairs, the late Principal Selbie bequeathed a rich legacy when he wrote *Freedom in the Faith*. He passes in review the tendencies of theological thought from the complacent Victorian belief in inevitable progress according to the will of God, down to modern humanism, with a recent swing-back to Barthianism and neo-Calvinism. From the dialectic thus surveyed he presents, not a synthesis, or compromise, or *via media*, but a plea for a presentation in plain terms of the vital elements of our faith, backed by a living experience and accompanied by a new liberal spirit of toleration among Christians. Selbie was no latitudinarian, however, and his book leaves no doubt about his own evangelical faith. In writing on the subject of sin, for instance, he will embolden a preacher to deal faithfully with the matter; we need, in doing so, to avoid a crude theology based on servile Bibliolatry on the one hand, and, on the other, a 'modern psychology which tends to reduce sin to moral disease, eliminates responsibility and the sense of guilt and would substitute re-education for repentance and psycho-analysis for forgiveness.' This is a book to be read and reread by all who would understand the drift of modern thought, and especially by any interested in Reunion, on which Dr. Selbie has some sound counsel and at least one novel proposal. His query 'Who is to tell the average man what is the will of God?' receives a reply in Leslie Weatherhead's expository and convincing little volume which is a timely protest against a phase of the still-persisting Victorian conception with which Dr. Selbie deals — that the will of God is an arbitrary affair which can never be understood, but must be met with humble and devout resignation. A perusal of Mr. Weatherhead's book will bring comfort to many, and light and understanding to all. The mere divisions of his subject are illuminating and thought-provoking — The intentional will of God, The circumstantial will of God, The ultimate will of God.

As an illustration of the changed atmosphere to which reference has been made one might compare the eagerly anticipated devotional and semi-devotional books of some forty or fifty years ago, — of which Dr. Miller's *Silent Times* series was typical, — with their opposite numbers to-day. What a distance we have travelled! Here, for in-

stance is F. W. Boreham again. The very title of his latest book would have shocked many Victorians. But here he is again; age cannot wither his felicitous style, nor custom stale his infinite variety of subject — and the root of the matter is still in him. He has a *flair* for titles, and finds sermons in 'Old Pipes' and 'Reservoirs', and good in everything, especially 'On being seventy'. Incidentally 'God has more light . . .' is more often attributed to John Robinson of Leyden than to Oliver Cromwell. Again the swing of the pendulum is displayed when we compare Rev. Samuel Horton's essays with that Victorian classic, Dr. Samuel Smiles's *Self Help*. The latter was largely an account of men who by perseverance 'made good', and made money. To this, Mr. Horton's is a spiritual supplement filled with stories of those who through suffering were made more nearly perfect. The veteran writer here speaks heart to heart. Mr. Hichen's style is forcible and direct but not dogmatic. The essays, or addresses, or sermonettes — call them any or all of these and you will not be wrong — will appeal to all general readers, but particularly to men and women in the Forces. Among the latter the *personnel* of the R.A.F. especially will appreciate the many homely illustrations taken from the routine and intimate life of an air-station. Mr. Hichens known their difficulties and temptations and has pertinent help to offer. He points men to Christ. In this he is more insistent than Mr. Elliott, whose advice, sound and excellent as far as it goes, falls short because he has failed to emphasize the vast resources of Divine grace and power available for all in need and distress. After all, the practice of the presence of God is a practical exercise. Mr. Elliott has scarcely done himself justice in these chapters, and this is a pity because he has already proved a guide, counsellor and friend to so many troubled folk.

HAROLD MALLINSON

*Problems in Parables.* By E. H. Booth. (Epworth Press. 1s. 6d.)

*The Glorious Company.* By Winifred Mathews. (Epworth Press. 2s.)

*The Other Inn.* By Margaret Harwood. (Epworth Press. 1s.)

*Prayer Book Interleaves.* By W. P. Ladd. (Milford. 8s. 6d.)

*The Beginning of the Way.* By 'A Greek Doctor'. (Lutterworth Press. 4s.)

The first of these books has been written in the conviction that the modern mind demands more than a dogmatic sermon, and that sermons should lead to questions and discussion. With this the reviewer agrees. Mr. Booth sets out, then, to provide specimen material for such discussion, basing it all on our Lord's parables. The intention is excellent — but it is doubtful whether the material is in fact direct enough for its purpose. It is suited to meditation rather than discussion. Whether it be used widely in the way the author hopes or no, it is to be commended sincerely as a hand-book of private devotion. *The Glorious Company* is the work of Mrs. Basil Mathews, for several years editor for The United Council for Missionary Education. The book is Church History narrated biographically, with an emphasis on the modern missionary period inaugurated by Carey. It will enable young people to realize what varieties of type Christ has used in the advance of the Gospel, from Boniface to John R. Mott. It is a token of the book's interest that in every case we are left wishing we had been told more. Indeed, those who recommend its use to Wesley Guilds, Study Circles, and the like, might well, when they do so, suggest sources of fuller information. *The Other Inn* is a Christmas Play by Margaret Harwood. The theme is attractive in its simplicity, but the emotional element is overdone. There are better plays available for dramatic groups eager to show what the Incarnation means.

'Prayer Book Interleaves' is a collection of articles first printed in the American magazine *The Witness*, and written by the Professor of Church History at the Berkeley Divinity School, Connecticut. The articles are reflections upon the Anglican Prayer Book; they are clearly the work of an enthusiast for liturgy, and are frequently

stimulating. Generally, however, they are too slight to be taken seriously, and the treatment of great subjects is sometimes spoiled by suggestions that are childish. For example, Professor Ladd proposes that during the Christmas communion service, the senior churchwarden, escorted by Al Brown, president of the Men's Club, and Cy Dow, superintendent of the Sunday School, each holding lighted candles, with someone else burning incense, should march down the aisle to read the Gospel. 'Might not such a ceremony do something to help win respect for the Gospel?' we are asked ingenuously. One can only say that in an English industrial town it would be thought silly! Here and there one finds traces of careless writing as when (p. 21) it is implied that the Methodists were driven from the Church of England by the activities of Keble, Pusey, and Newman! It is interesting to notice Professor Ladd's disparagement of private prayer, and his advocacy of communion in one kind.

The United Society for Christian Literature has performed a useful service in publishing a new translation of St. Luke and the Acts under the title *The Beginnings of the Way*. In a generation in which many intelligent young people know practically nothing of the Christian Gospel a book of this kind is admirably suited to be put into their hands, rather than that they should be offered a complete New Testament with its later technicalities.

W. W.

*Spiritualism and Religion.*<sup>1</sup> By G. W. Butterworth. (S.P.C.K. 9s.)

From the title of this book one might expect reference to the quality of life which intercourse with departed friends produces. This would include conversion from agnosticism, triumphant faith under bereavement, the abolition of thoughtlessness, the religious aspirations of Christians quickened, and the importance of Christ's emphasis on good-will more intelligently realized and more earnestly practised. But in this book religion as a way of living is ignored; we are shown instead how the opinions of sundry Spiritualists differ from orthodoxy. The author seems unaware that Spiritualism has no doctrinal standards, most of its adherents retaining their previous views with such modifications as are becoming usual among the educated in the several churches. No mention is made of the fact that two outstanding mediums were Church of England clergymen, or that excellent books have come from the pens of Spiritualist clergy. Instead of studying these Dr. Butterworth scents doctrinal errors in relatively unimportant publications. Long years of inside acquaintance with psychical communication and with Spiritualists enables the present reviewer to say that the latter could stand up to Our Lord's test of character by the side of any other group of good folk. 'By their fruits ye shall know them' is a more reliable criterion of religion than the weighing of theological opinions. It was unfortunate that Dr. Butterworth should select his extracts mostly from writers who entered Spiritualism with Unitarian views. He says nothing of Christian Spiritualists — indeed, he appears to be unaware that they exist, for (p. 188) he alludes to 'Spiritualists and Christians' in a way suggesting that one could not be both. He is particularly ill-informed in writing (p. 87) that 'communion with spirits appears completely to replace communion with God'. That is sheer nonsense and untrue. He dislikes our description of Realms beyond Death; he would prefer something more completely unlike earth. Well, all in God's good time. Perhaps few, if any, are qualified to 'bear the burning bliss' immediately; progress toward that felicity must surely depend on progress in love and wisdom. Few would feel at ease if translated at one bound into the Higher Heavens where all earthly likeness may be superseded. If the departed give descriptions of their surroundings and exhibit a new scale of values,

<sup>1</sup> We have asked a Spiritualist to review this book, leaving him free to write as he thinks best.  
—EDITOR.

it is not to be expected that these will be identical with our preconceived ideas; else why should they be given? New wine requires new wine-skins, but it is ever the way with official guardians of the more ancient articles of faith to depreciate the new in favour of their own tenets. On one point very many Spiritualists agree with the author, namely that Spiritualism is not a religion; rather is it a movement in thought having religious implications. Lord Dowding states the case clearly, 'Supposing that I go to a medium and make contact with the spirit of my dead uncle who tells me where the missing will is to be found. Is that Spiritualism? If not, what else is it? Yet it has nothing to do with religion. If one insists on a religious connotation for the word "Spiritualism" he must provide us with another label for the general study of intercommunication with spirits. Spiritualism and Religion, though constantly overlapping, are essentially separate.' Although not a religion, Spiritualism has, in some localities, become a sect; this is where Spiritualists who had no church connection, or who have been persecuted for their belief, worship together in groups called Churches. A recent writer remarks, 'Present-day Spiritualism is in the keeping of various little societies struggling to give light in an untrained, sometimes uneducated, way to their fellow men. This is not the fault of Spiritualism, but of its being cast out by those best fitted to teach and develop it'. Occasionally Dr. Butterworth shows uneasiness amid his sweeping condemnations, as when he writes (p. 162), 'It is too much to assert confidently that no genuine communication ever takes place. We who believe that our loved ones beyond the veil are still alive cannot deny that they may try to communicate with us, and that communication may be possible . . . the Church should not forbid mourners to explore the Spiritualist's path if they wish.' This brief review omits reference to the numerous controversial points on which the author pronounces with a too easy confidence. His scholarship and mental acuteness are no substitute for absence of personal experience and, should readers follow him blindly, they would be making for that destination into which 'the blind lead the blind'.

G. C. DRAYTON THOMAS

*A Background to the Old Testament.* By Leonard T. Towers. (Independent Press, 3s. 6d.)

These four lectures were originally designed to meet the needs of school teachers, to show how the religious ideas of the Old Testament are related to our life and thought. The author states the reasons why children dislike the teaching of religion. Into sixty-two pages Mr. Towers has compressed much material and given evidence of his own competence. Very skilfully he was worked out the relation between the climate and the geography of Palestine and the development of the Hebrew race. In the introductory lecture, 'The Dawn of Religion', the value of higher criticism as an aid to correct teaching is shown. 'The Bible is not merely the story of an obscure Semitic tribe, nor is it just the account, often distorted and sometimes sordid, of a people's gradual and painful discovery of a religion'. It is step by step, the revelation or self-disclosure of God.

'The God of the Burning Bush', the second lecture, relates the call of Moses to the 'Numinous', and the development of the Covenant concept. The phases of belief with Jehovah as a family god, a nomadic god, an agricultural god, are shown to culminate in the monotheistic faith of Deutero-Isaiah. Our relation to a living, moral God, jealous because He is holy, is shown at this point. A comparison of Hammurabi's code and the Book of the Covenant is given, so also an appendix on the relation between Mosaic ideas and the Zoroastrian religion. In the third lecture, 'The great Age of Prophecy', the difference between a prophet and a diviner is subtly shown. The messages of the first group of written prophets are succinctly dealt with. The

prophet clearly emerges as a man through whom God still speaks, using as tool everyday experiences. 'Jehoiachim' is once or twice printed for 'Jehoiachin'. The last lecture, 'The Anticipations of The Messiah', is skilfully done. Very cleverly Mr. Towers has shown how the patriotism of the Jews under pressure, resulted in Apocalyptic literature with its hope of 'the Day of the Lord', on the one hand, and on the other fierce fighting. The great expectations of what the Law could do, and what a Messiah would accomplish, are dealt with, through the medium of the Psalter, and the Suffering Servant poems.

The very modern lesson which is patiently being learned by thousands now, was made clear in Old Testament Faith — that suffering on behalf of others has a redemptive power. This leads to Christ who emerges not merely as a figure from history, but One who comes into history, and fulfils more than the prophets ever conceived.

NORMAN GREENHALGH

*We Saw the Holy City.* By Leslie Farmer. (Epworth Press, 12s. 6d.)

Among the many modern books about Palestine this one is of special interest because it is written by a Chaplain to the Forces who has served for years in the Middle East. To his surprise and delight the author found himself posted in Jerusalem, and discovered there an opportunity 'for a special sort of ministry which no other place could provide'. He determined that part of his work for the troops under his care should be to serve as a guide to the holy places. 'Surely men could be led more readily into the life of faith as they were shown the very place where Jesus was born and where He died; as they looked upon Gabbatha and the Via Dolorosa, and the Tomb of the Resurrection!' Here is a vivid record of many pilgrimages both in Jerusalem itself and to other sacred sites in the neighbourhood, such as Bethlehem and Emmaus. There is a chapter on Galilee. Mr. Farmer found his way also to many spots that are 'off the beaten track'. The author has a sturdy conviction concerning the superiority of Free Church forms of worship as compared with what seemed to him the 'unreality' of much that he witnessed in Palestine, but that by no means prevents him from giving detailed descriptions of many of the services and ceremonies of other communions which he attended during his journeys in the Holy Land. A chapter on 'Lepers' contains an interesting account of a visit to the Moravian leper-hospital. This book will make not only a welcome addition to a Sunday School library, but teachers — and preachers — who read the book will find in it much useful material. Its value is further increased by a number of excellent modern illustrations of the Holy Land.

W. F. FLEMINGTON

*The Case for Examinations.* By J. L. Brereton. (Cambridge University Press, 8s. 6d.)

This book has been written to show that examinations are a necessary part of the machinery of education. There was need for such a book as this at a time when our whole system of education is being remodelled. At such a time it is inevitable that the plea will be made that our children are over-examined and that the effects of examinations are unfortunate and their reports indeterminate. Professor Valentine's book on *The Reliability of Examinations* was followed by the inquiry of Sir Philip Hartog and E. C. Rhodes and other investigations. Finally the Norwood Report, which appeared last year, condemned the whole system of examinations and proposed that internal examinations should take the place of external ones, with new powers and influence to a greatly increased Inspectorate. It is chiefly the examinations in secondary schools that are under review, but entrance to the secondary schools from the primary schools is also considered. There is a general demand that the Schools Certificate and Higher Certificate examinations should be modified or



abolished. The universities are blamed for imposing their needs on the school curriculum and standardization is regretted where an increase of freedom is most desirable.

The history of secondary education in England shows how large a part examinations have played first in creating a standard for *curricula* and then in raising the standard of work done. The changes in these examinations over the last fifty years are, however, surprisingly small. Their original duty has been carried out and the time has come for change. Mr. Brereton is not in favour of revolutionary change. He does not accept the suggestions of the Norwood report but prefers to make use of regional examining bodies on which the teachers take an important place. He brings a wide experience to his very full discussion of the subject and his views will certainly receive a considerable measure of support.

A. W. HARRISON

*The Englishman and his History.* By H. Butterfield. (Cambridge University Press. 3s. 6d. net.)

This book shows how the character of the Englishman has been shaped by his history. The recently appointed Professor of Modern History at Cambridge treats his subject in a fresh and stimulating way throughout. It is in his politics that this aspect of the Englishman's character appears most clearly. He is not willing to cut himself completely off from his past as the Frenchman was ready to do in 1789. Hence we get the characteristic English moderation, compromise and ordered progress. So the Whig interpretation of history is the essentially English interpretation. In 1940, when the country was faced with its greatest peril, all the Whig views of freedom came to life once more, 'throbbing and alive again, and now projected upon an extended map'. This view came into being in the seventeenth century and owes as much to Coke with his view of Common Law as to Pym and Hampden. The interpretation of Magna Carta that was given then and the idea that Parliament was of immemorial antiquity might be wrong, but the King was effectively placed under law and the possibility of an English submission to autocracy became remote.

Yet liberty must not become license and man must not attempt to force the pace on Providence. 'There is a Providence in the historical process which sometimes (and indeed perhaps often in the long run) is on the side of the mediocrities. And who among us would exchange the long line of amiable or prudent statesmen in English history for all those masterful and awe-inspiring geniuses who have imposed themselves on France and Germany in modern times?' Professor Butterfield is particularly interesting in showing how the English passed through the century of religious war and the age of reason to these secular times without losing contact with Christian sanctions. The influence of a thousand years of Christian history still counts in our politics. This is not a long essay but it is packed with fact and interpretation of fact and it will stimulate many readers to pursue the subject further.

A. W. HARRISON

*Christ and National Reconstruction.* By John S. Hoyland. (Epworth Press. 5s.)

*My Protest to the Archbishops — Coercion or Voluntarism?* By Sir Lennox Russell. (Discussion Groups Association. 1s.)

*Those Clouded Hills.* By B. L. Coombes. (Cobbett Publishing Co. 5s.)

Whether John S. Hoyland writes of 'Digging with the Unemployed', or 'Prayer and the Social Revolution', or 'How Christ met aggression', he is always fresh and he always stimulates. There is very little in the present book which has not already been found in germ in his earlier books, yet this is made all the more useful by the form in which he presents it. The book is meant for Study Circles, and at the end

of each chapter there are suggestions for group discussion. Happy the pastor who gathers around him a band of young people who would consider seriously the line of conduct here delineated. For Hoyland aims at nothing short of this — *to influence conduct*. This was why in the years of depression he was not satisfied merely to study the unemployment problem, but went digging with the unemployed, sharing their life, showing such practical sympathy that the men with whom he worked became his friends. In this book he will have nothing to do with a reconstruction based on any other force than the force of friendship. He finds his inspiration in the life of our Lord, whose words he has pondered so long that their deepest meaning seems to have burned itself into his consciousness. He will advocate nothing which does not spring out of his vital apprehension of the teaching and method of Christ, his Christ. For John Hoyland's Christ is not everybody's Christ. Many a highly placed ecclesiastic would disown Him as not sufficiently theological. But then, Hoyland has little interest in the metaphysical dignity of Jesus; he wants to see this horrible world of carnage transformed into a world of sanity and friendliness. He believes he has found the key to the world's problems, and the way to the reconstruction of which he dreams. He does not, like Niebuhr, postpone the coming of the Kingdom of God to the other world; he believes in the possibility of its coming here, in this present world of time; and if such a man is to be labelled 'Liberal Christian', then I think Hoyland would gladly bear the title. At any rate, I agree with him when he suggests that the conduct of Jesus should set the standard for our own conduct in relation to the terribly grave social, political, and economic problems we are facing. If anyone can be a reliable guide, surely it is the inspired Man who was called upon to deal with very similar problems in His own day. This book is written to make clear what the attitude of Christ is. It will not please the 'fighting left'; it may even shock the 'on to orthodoxy' school; but it will win the interest of those who are sincerely anxious to reconstruct the world on the principles of One whom both the 'fighting left' and the 'woolly right' seem to have misunderstood.

Sir Lennox Russell's pamphlet is a strong criticism of the late Archbishop of Canterbury's *Christianity and Social Order* and Dr. Garbett's article *Should the Church Keep Out?* Sir Lennox is horrified by the 'modern spate of materialistic social legislation'. The worst of it is that misguided clergy have helped such unwise schemes. Some have even sponsored such causes as housing reform and the care of invalid children! Do the clergy who have acted so unwisely not see that most of the ills from which the poor suffer are due to indigence or lack of sturdy character? And more important still, do they not see that it is wicked to bespoil the rich merely to help the very poor? Leave it all to the good nature of the rich. Let the clergy join the Discussion Groups Association and they will learn how all these social questions will right themselves. For the wealthy are all philanthropists at heart; all they need is freedom from the interference of socially-awakened clerics and from legislation which would make them disgorge some of their wealth! Yet the pamphlet is worth reading. It only costs a shilling, and here are Machiavelli and Marx, Bentham and Beaconsfield, Cole and Cripps — and two Archbishops: there is also the erudition of Sir Lennox Russell.

*Those Clouded Hills* is the best book by a working miner I have read. Its graphic description of the life of a Welsh miner should do much to dissipate the false ideas which so many people, who do not know the miner intimately, still hold. Here the miner and his conditions are set forth so vividly that, having opened the book, one must read on to the end. The author does not try to depict the miner as a plaster saint: nor does he hold that the miner's conduct — especially that of a thoughtless minority — has not at times been unworthy of the great Welsh tradition. But Mr. Coombes leaves in the mind the idea that the typical miner is a clean-living,

hard-working, intelligent, long-suffering, and almost unbelievably patient man. This book does for the reading public what *How Green was my Valley* did for the film-goer. It does more: it gives facts and figures which at times fill one with deep resentment that so fine a body of men have had such scanty justice from the people who own and are said to 'work' the coal. No body of men has more cause for resentment than the miners. Too often their hardships have been glossed over by a thoughtless people. If this book does anything to win for them the respect and fairdealing which are their due — and which have ever been denied them — it will not have been written in vain. I wish for it the large circulation it deserves.

PERCY S. GARDEN

*Break Up the German Reich!* By F. Victor Fisher. (Anglo-French Alliance, 26 Buckland Crescent, N.W.3., 6d.)

*The Way to Peace.* By Lionel Curtis. (Oxford University Press, 1s.)

*Max Weber and German Politics.* A Study in Political Sociology. By J. P. Mayer. (Faber and Faber. 8s. 6d.)

\*The problem that faces the allied nations in the immediate future is three-fold — what to do or try to do with Germany; what to do or try to do with the world; and on what lines a stable international society can be built. On the first of these Mr. Victor Fisher's pamphlet is vigorous and confident. German aggressiveness has grown from the dominance of Prussia. German unity is the danger, because it is rooted in Prussian control. The yoke of the Prussian junkers must be broken. It sounds simple. The difficulties will be to decide upon the frontiers, geographical and economic as well as political, to erect governments in the new states, and to prevent reunion in the future — an ungrateful and (as the history of the *Anschluss* would suggest) a well-nigh impossible task. It would mean challenging not what is the worst in Germany but what is possibly the best. Germany's claws must be drawn; but she must be left with other things to think about than how to grow them again.

Dr. Lionel Curtis' pamphlet follows three others — *Decision, Decision and Action, Faith and Works* — all written with the same underlying conviction and all inspired by something like religious fervour. He sees, like the authors of the Dumbarton Oaks report, and incidentally, like an influential group of Americans who have just produced, under the auspices of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, a 'Design for the Charter of the General International Organization', and indeed like all who would consider to any purpose the lessons of the League of Nations, that nothing will be settled till we decide, first, what force is to be employed if the decisions of the world authority are flouted by any nation or nations, and secondly, who is to possess the power that will call that force into action. Dr. Curtis takes his own line. He is profoundly distrustful of any joint international police force. Who will deny that recent history supports him? The secret of inter-state stability, he holds, was discovered when the thirteen American States decided to establish one military force under one control. At the least, the British and American commonwealths must be 'included in one organic relation for this purpose'. Though the author has, he admits, found no support for this idea among statesmen, audiences in the forces have applauded it. It is a pamphlet to be widely and carefully studied.

Max Weber is not well known in England; but he ranked, till his death in 1920, among the leaders of the political sociologists in Germany. Fortunate in passing from the scene before the blight of Hitlerism fell on all independent thought, he was identified with everything that could be called, in Germany, progressive, and in particular played a leading part in the formation of the Weimar Constitution; yet on October 15, 1914, he could write 'this war is with all its ugliness great and wonderful; it is worth while experiencing it'. If his very industrious and well-

informed biographer — already well known for his work on French political theory — has made anything clear, it is that this leading sociologist held all his life through that, in spite of the tension between power and justice, the 'reasons of State' are supreme, and the State itself the 'monopoly for legitimate physical violence'. This explains why a German may suffer from the Gestapo and still believe in it. The author's own conclusions on the future are well worth pondering over.

W. F. LOFTHOUSE

*The Summing Up.* By C. A. Hinks. (Williams and Norgate. 2s. 6d.)

Since long poems are now rarely written, a reader who comes across Mr. Hinks' *The Summing Up* may put it aside, since eleven hundred lines of irregular unrhymed verse must surely either be the work of some survivor from Victorian days or the first effort of a novice passing through the necessary, imitative phase of his apprenticeship. But such a reader will have made a great mistake. *The Summing Up* may be Mr. Hinks' first published work and it certainly reminds one of Browning's skill in dramatic monologue — but this does not detract from its worth. Here a typical middle-class Englishman is represented as a prisoner charged with treason

'for that of his malice he betrayed  
the serious solemn trust of civilization',

and the poem is the judge's address to the jury, which is composed of historians to be born hereafter. The events of our generation are shown as they have affected this man of forty years of age. His formative years were those of the false prosperity which followed the last war. Charged with the deliberate destruction of goodwill and international order, he is shown as subject to the changing influences of the years between the two world wars. His concern for the workers, his pursuit of personal gain, his false hopes of preserving peace simply by avowing the evil of war and abstaining from military training, all these and many other contributory causes are examined. He has been well-meaning, if somewhat futile. The judge points to his sincerity through all

'his complete experience of twenty miserable years',

to his chief dilemma, how to preserve ideals amid the maelstrom of evil —

'He was no leader-saint but an unhappy  
rearward straggler through the dark of the world',

and also to the transitoriness of contemporary standards,

'in particular religion  
once the surest solvent for such troubles'.

Mr. Hinks, a Methodist lawyer, has brought considerable forensic skill into this work, and the argument holds one's attention. His poem is quite free from the bitterness and meretricious cleverness which mars so much modern poetry. He has summed up the plight of his generation, leaving the verdict to the tranquillity of later historians when

'the turmoil of an evil age  
sounds but as distant tossing sea-bell speaks  
to inland valleys of the sea-storms' rage'.

HAROLD S. DARBY

*Scottish Book of Male Voice Praise.* By James McRoberts. (56 Maryhill Road, Glasgow, N.W. 2s. 5d. post free.)

Male-voice singing has all too small a place in modern musical usage. At the beginning of this century the Brotherhood Movement and the influence of competitive musical festivals gave greater encouragement to men's choirs. James McRoberts is doing a welcome service in aiding the revival of male-voice singing as an instrument for evangelism. He has compiled a hymnal of 52 songs, some of which are original compositions and others adaptations of well-known tunes. Many of them will have the appeal which, despite all criticism, lies in the simplicity of 'Sankey'. At the same time simplicity needs to conform to grammatical standards and here the editor of this collection has gone astray. It is true that certain liberties are allowed in male-voice part writing, but they should be under expert direction. It is a pity that a noble tune like 'Ein Feste Burg' should have been altered so drastically and crudely. Even though unison is often effectively used by male voices, there is no excuse for a whole dozen consecutive octaves. I notice the name of my brilliant friend Dr. Westbrook among the contributors. Had he been consulted many faults might have been avoided and a most useful addition to sacred song would have lost nothing in spiritual power and gained greatly in musical accuracy. Yet this book is an excellent experiment, which will render real service in the task of reaching men with the message of Christ.

NOEL F. HUTCHCROFT

*Highways and Byways.* By Leslie A. Newman. (Epworth Press. 3s. 6d.)

*Share My Fortune.* By Edward Fittall. (Epworth Press. 3s.)

A modern experiment in an eighteenth-century evangelistic method accounts for the publication of Mr. Newman's book. It is a collection of incidents which impressed him on his travels through Yorkshire on horseback, preaching and teaching the Gospel as opportunity presented itself, after the manner of John Wesley. With the aid of 'Dick Turpin', the horse, the author visited well known places — Robin Hood's Bay, Whitby, Littlebeck, Farndale, Rievaulx, Staveley, Long Marston, and the hills and dales of Yorkshire — on a pre-arranged itinerary. He covered about 800 miles during this horse-back holiday, preaching Christ to all who would listen.

Novel methods of 'getting over' old truths come into the story. The book is not without its touches of humour and pathos. Every situation is used to 'get across' some spiritual truth. A young man in a tank who declares that he is 'hot as hell', is left with a challenge about sin and its consequences. A group of soldiers, playing whist, are introduced to Him who always plays a game in which hearts are trumps. The children who gather around the horse out of curiosity are told of the great Rider who once went into Jerusalem upon the back of an ass on which no man had ever sat. Wherever Mr. Newman went he linked the past with the present application of the Gospel of Christ. The halfplate of Rievaulx Abbey, in the ruins of which the author held a service, is a good one; so also is the photo of Scagglethorpe Methodist Chapel, where Dr. Dinsdale T. Young preached his first sermon, when a boy of fifteen years. This experiment convinced Mr. Newman that Christianity is still alive, especially in country places. He shares with his readers the sunshine and the shadows of his journey. He describes himself as a cavalry commando who has been afresh commanded by Calvary. The spirit which breathes through the book is that of the tender concern of a Minister of God for those in the highways and byways. It closes with an appeal for an order of modern Friars. It is written in a sincere, humble and gracious spirit.

As a very light, readable, gipsy-life fantasy Mr. Fittall's book is to be commended. This is, we gather, not his first book, and his previous readers will know what to



expect. The characters of Richard Button, the gamekeeper, Larky Fowler, the landlord of 'The Bridled Ass', a curious old gipsy woman, and Jas, are all sketchily drawn, and form the background for the story of a romance between the beautiful Dinah and Abel Hawk. As a descriptive writer Mr. Fittall has caught the spirit of gipsy life, though the book is written in a style which is somewhat difficult to follow, and there is a trick of threefold repetition which some will find monotonous. Of more value than the actual story is the atmosphere of the country side, and the free open-air life which the characters live. This the author has succeeded in conveying. The descriptions of the heat of the noonday sun, the smoke of the fires in gipsy encampments, the green leaves, the hedges close with hazels and hawthorns, the lane sides spiced with furze, a kestrel's flight and its slow and reluctant descent like an old sycamore leaf, an old field mouse grey with experience, the cooing of doves, the swaying buzz of bees, all capture the imagination. Those who love the countryside and revel in country life will delight in a Romany Tale told for the sheer joy of telling.

N.G.

---

### *From My New Shelf*

BY C. RYDER SMITH

*The Statesmanship of Thought and the Spirit of Power.* By Wilbert F. Howard. (Epworth Press. 6d.)

In the theological world the President of the Methodist Conference is well known as perhaps the greatest living authority on two subjects — the grammar of New Testament Greek and what is called 'Introduction' to the Fourth Gospel. But to those who know him 'after the flesh' he is much more. This year the Methodists will learn this as he passes to and fro among them. It is a good thing that his two Presidential addresses have been published, for they need to be pondered as well as to be heard. Neither title does justice to their wealthy contents. They both urge the duty of self-discipline, the one in the face of the state of the world, the other in the cure of souls. Here the scholarly and the evangelical meet together under the demand that Christians need both to 'out-think' and 'out-live' their fellow-men. The use of many apposite and un-hackneyed quotations is only one of the merits of these searching and inspiring addresses.

*The Family and the State.* By W. F. Lofthouse. (Epworth Press. 6s.)

Dr. Lofthouse has chosen a very timely subject for his Beckly Lecture. At long last the State has begun to realize that it must deal with the family as a whole and not merely with such individual members of it as are in clamant need. It has not yet found its way to all the right methods and possibly not to any of them. Indeed, it has hardly even taken stock of the problem as a whole. This is just what this volume seeks to do.

The book falls naturally into three parts. Dr. Lofthouse insists that here as elsewhere we must study the past if we are to deal aright with the present and the future. The first five chapters, therefore, discuss historical antecedents. One describes the family as 'the social unit'. This, of course, is to challenge the individualism of the nineteenth century, for, as Dr. Lofthouse points out, an individual is a monstrosity unless he is a person and personality can only develop in a society — and the fundamental society is the family. All others presuppose it, either directly or

indirectly. The next two chapters describe the family as an 'asset' and as a 'liability'. The latter is a very necessary chapter, for Christian apologists often shut their eyes to the harm that the family has done, especially when it has been a self-centred social unit. The fourth chapter is one of the most valuable. In it the author takes a rapid but comprehensive survey of the history of the family since history itself clearly emerged. He finds that, amid a bewildering diversity, there are five marks of the family always and everywhere — it is bound up with kinship; it lives by sharing; however unconsciously, it is based on a unique system of reciprocal rights and duties; willy-nilly, it is inter-connected in manifold ways with society at large; it has usually been fundamentally religious and has never quite succeeded in being merely secular. A great part of Dr. Lofthouse's later discussion returns to these marks. He points out that he has not included affection. Yet, of course, if any one of the five characteristics is to be at its best, there is need for affection in one form or another. But Dr. Lofthouse will not follow the common English way of sentimentalizing marriage. A true home needs much more than an intense affection between a man and a woman. Indeed, in many countries it does not begin with this. The first part of the book ends with a chapter which shows that, with the family as with the individual, there is a place for 'nurture' as well as 'nature'.

In the second part of the book Dr. Lofthouse turns to our own country. He has three chapters that display the way in which the State in England has dealt with the family since the Reformation. Apart from divorce, it did not deal with it directly at all for three centuries — largely under the influence of the half truth that 'the Englishman's home is his castle'. Its social legislation, in one form or other, sought no more than to mitigate extreme poverty. Yet indirectly every such effort had its influence on the family. Now at last the State begins to realize that it cannot let the family alone, that it must deal with it as a whole, and that it must seek to provide full opportunity for true family life rather than merely seek to ameliorate disaster.

Thirdly, Dr. Lofthouse turns to three very pertinent subjects. The first is, 'What have the New Testament and Christianity to say about all this?' Some will think that here he cautiously claims too little rather than too much. Next, he describes the way in which woman has been wrongly subordinated to man in the family — nominally for this reason or that, but fundamentally because physical strength is on man's side. Finally, there is a careful diagnosis of three complex but urgent problems — divorce, the birth-rate, and conception-control. Here Dr. Lofthouse is too wise to prescribe simple remedies.

Again and again Dr. Lofthouse, in describing historical facts, makes incisive and illuminating comments. He has numerous useful references to relevant literature. Here and there one may query a detail, but there is nothing else to query. One of the welcome features of the book is its insistence that a family has duties to society as well as claims upon it. Another is its claim that the State, in dealing with the family, should sedulously seek the voluntary aid of experts other than its own. Dr. Lofthouse, showing how the family has persisted through millenniums of change, believes that, *if we do our duty by it*, its present perils will prove its benefit. This book is likely to take its place as authoritative in its subject.

*National Churches and the Church Universal.* By F. Dvornik. (Dacre Press. 2s.)

If ever the Christian Church is re-united, what form will it take? Behind the Lambeth Appeal of 1920 there seemed to be an ideal of a kind of federation of national (or local) churches, but the question of the ultimate authority in the federation was not raised — quite properly, for the problem is far distant. Yet it does arise for every believer in re-union, and for the Anglo-Catholic it is urgent, as the very word 'Anglo-Catholic' suggests. Dr. Dvornik was asked to speak on the subject

in more than an Anglo-Catholic gathering, and this book is the result. He is Professor in the Charles IV University of Prague, though at present in England. He deals with the problem, not from the dogmatic but from the historical point of view. The survey shows that the Professor not only knows all the literature, particularly the German literature, but is its master. Rarely has so much been said in so small space. Dr. Dvornik has a superb gift of clear compression. In these lectures he does not say much of the familiar period since the Reformation, but he covers the whole of the centuries from the first to the sixteenth. He has not a few surprises even for the student of Church history. His chief purpose, however, is to show how the problem of the relation between the universal Church and national churches is almost as old as Christianity, and how it has been dealt with in different times and areas. One is tempted sometimes to say that the Church was often pragmatist in fact, finding theoretical reasons for its ways afterwards! Not the least interesting part of the book concerns the Eastern Church. Here, of course, from first to last the emphasis has in practice been upon 'autocephaly', while in the West it was more and more on autocracy. Rome has never accepted the federal concept. There is much too on the difference of the ways of the East and the West in dealing with the culture of classical times, on the attitude of East and West to vernaculars, on the persistent concept of the *rex sacerdos*, and so on and so on. Dr. Dvornik himself seems to favour the idea of a large measure of national autonomy under the supreme and final authority of Rome. He claims, indeed, that there is documentary evidence that this is what Photius, the Eastern Patriarch, proposed in the ninth century. But this book is not controversial, and its value does not depend upon the solution that the author very modestly puts forward. It is history at its best. It is to be hoped that we shall soon see other works of Dr. Dvornik's in English.

*Sociology of the Renaissance.* By Alfred von Martin. (Kegan Paul. ?s.)

This essay was published in Germany in 1932 and has now been translated by W. L. Luetkens for the International Library of Sociology. By implication it answers the question, 'Where did modern capitalism come from?' The writer, whose method is strictly historical and who draws no morals for to-day, shows that in the later Middle Ages there arose and grew and matured and decayed a capitalistic system, fundamentally of the modern kind, in the cities of Northern Italy, with Florence as the typical example. The Renaissance has usually been studied on the side of literature and art, but it goes without saying that these things do not exist *in vacuo* but pre-suppose a given kind of society — even when they protest against it. It is remarkable that so little attention has been given to this. The essay falls into three parts — 'The New Dynamic', 'The Curve of Development', and 'Renaissance Society and the Church'. It first traces the rise of a number of city states, based upon commerce and pursuing a commercial policy both within their small territories and in the world at large. In other words it describes the way in which the *haute bourgeoisie* rose to power — a new dynamic shattering the old static society of feudalism. For instance, Dr. von Martin shows that feudalism had rested upon the static concept of land or space, but that with the dominance of a commercial class the value of time, which is not static but mobile, was more than recognized. Modern hurry took its rise then. In the second part of the essay the author traces the process by which this first modern capitalism reached a climax, forsook its own dynamic, and declined — leaving, as he might have added, a dismal destiny to Italy for three centuries. What about the Church? In his third part Dr. von Martin shows, quite objectively, how the Roman Church, led by the Curia, compromised with capitalism in theory and still more in practice. It was the capitalistic spirit that led Leo X to send out the purveyors of Indulgences for the building of St. Peter's. Tetzl was a

'commercial traveller'. So much for the claim that capitalism is the child of Protestantism! Yet, as our author hints — though to describe the process would have led him beyond the scope of the essay — Protestantism in its turn compromised in its own way. In short, as others have recently argued, the 'humanism' of the Renaissance proved too strong for the Church in both its great branches. This book, as already hinted, draws no lessons for to-day — but there are many to draw. History, of course, never altogether repeats itself, but it none the less has its repetitions. It seems clear now that once more a capitalistic system is to pass into something else. Is it to leave a larger legacy of decay and division than in this earlier instance? Does the answer depend upon the Church? This calm study gives one 'furiously to think' about many things. One of its minor virtues is its placing of such men as Lorenzo de Medici, Savonarola and Machiavelli in their right historical perspective. With Lorenzo the decline of capitalism began; Savonarola led a revolt of the proletariat against it; Machiavelli was both its child and its enemy. Everywhere the essayist shows that he is master of the extensive contemporary literature that illuminates his theme. The services of capitalism to art are more than admitted.

*Sermons on Several Occasions.* By John Wesley. (Epworth Press. 5s.)

Wesley's *Forty-four Sermons and Notes on the New Testament* are still the 'standards' of the Methodist Church. This is remarkable when it is remembered how often, in the century after his death, the choice of two such books for such a purpose had been the subject of criticism and even of ridicule. Yet the appeal to the system of doctrine contained in these two books, as contrasted, for instance, with appeals to formulated Creeds, has stood the test of experience so well that, when Methodist Union was consummated, no better 'standards' could be found. Methodism, of course, is not committed to every detail in Wesley's exposition; neither, on the other hand, is a Methodist preacher, whether Minister or layman, allowed to preach just what he likes. He has 'elbow room' but not license. Almost as many of these sermons are about Christian conduct as about Evangelical theology. For instance, people who quote Wesley's three rules for the use of money may learn here how he expounded the first, 'Gain all you can'. It is no principle of grab. While Sugden's annotated edition of the *Sermons* remains the edition, it is well that the Epworth Press has now met the insistent demand for a cheaper issue.

*The Amended Lectionary for Sundays and Certain Holy Days.* (Church Assembly Press Board, Westminster. 6d.)

A Committee of the Convocation of Canterbury has given two years' hard work to the production of this lectionary, and it has been approved 'for experimental use' by both Convocations. The task of lectionary-makers is a hard one. One of the chief difficulties falls under the question, 'On what principle shall the Lessons be arranged?' There have been three main methods — to follow the order of the books in the English Bible; to follow the order in which the books were written; and to follow the Calendar of the Christian Year. In this lectionary, by a happy compromise, the last two methods are both used — the Christian Year being followed from Advent to Trinity, and the order of the writing of the books from Trinity onwards. The findings of modern scholarship are followed in fixing the dates of the books. For the first time Lessons from the Apocrypha have sometimes been selected without alternatives from the fully canonical books. Most of the Lessons from the Apocrypha are selected from Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom; but the Books of Ezdras and Maccabees are also used. At one point the Committee seems to have lost courage. It has not seen its way altogether to abandon the old practice of choosing Lessons for Advent from passages that refer to the Second Advent, but has mingled these with passages

about the First. Is this wise? Are not the stories of the Birth of Christ the best for the Christmas season? The Lectionary covers two years, and this, of course, admits of the use of twice as many passages. A lectionary is of no use except to regular worshippers, but to-day some of these attend only in the morning and others only in the evening. This lectionary provides a consecutive series of Lessons for both kinds of 'oncours'. It will be of great service to all who take the reading of the Scriptures in public worship seriously — even to those preachers who prefer to make their own lectionary. The Committee's report appears as preface.

*The Scholar and the Future of the Research Library.* By Fremont Rider. (Hadham Press. New York. \$4.)

'If the library of Yale University continues to grow at the rate at which it has grown for over two centuries, it will, a century hence, have approximately two hundred million volumes'. This is a specimen of a problem that is already upon us. How are the books to be made accessible? In this volume the Librarian of the Wesleyan University (U.S.A.) describes the problem and proposes a solution by the use of 'micro-cards', that claims to be both simple, drastic and definitive. Only experts can adequately estimate its value.

*Gandhi.* By Carl Heath. (Allen & Unwin. 2s.)

In this little work the author does not seek to say anything new about Mr. Gandhi, but to help Englishmen to realize that, whatever mistakes he may have made in his political moves, he is fundamentally a prophet, a 'dynamic' man, who is changing and will change India and the world. Mr. Heath claims that when *ahimsa* and *satyagraha* are rightly understood, they are Christian virtues. But do not Mr. Gandhi's principles derive in part from Christianity and in part from Hinduism, and is not this why he is such an enigma — and such a power? There is no doubt about his greatness. Mr. Heath thinks that the British should yield to Gandhi's demand for India's political freedom 'now' and negotiate on that basis.

*The Dutch Nation, an Historical Study.* By G. J. Renier. (Allen and Unwin. 15s.)

All the current plans for the post-war international world suggest some kind or kinds of federation. We need, therefore, to study the types of federal constitution and especially the major problem of the relation of the whole and the members to each other. Since the 'Dutch Republic', as Dr. Renier calls it for lack of a better name, was a federation of federations, its history is interesting for this reason as well as for its own sake. Dr. Renier knows the story of his people as few do. For instance, he quotes abundantly from the multitudinous pamphlets that illuminate the story of Holland. He has an introductory chapter, mainly on the story of the revolt against Philip of Spain (for whom he has a good word), but his subject is the history of the Northern Netherlands from the Union of Utrecht in 1579 to the beginnings of the Dutch monarchy in the time of Napoleon. He has little detail about such things as wars — for example, he doesn't name any of Marlborough's victories — but he gives one of his longer chapters to Jacob Cats, because he was a typical Dutch 'Regent' of the better kind, and another to 'A Burgomaster's Daughter', because her story illustrates intimately and vividly the life of a typical Dutch town. The 'free town' is the dominant social unit throughout the story — that is, a town that was medieval because it had no over-lord, but that now knew no allegiance either to Emperor or King. A federation of such towns, with some small recognition of the landed nobility, formed what we wrongly call a 'province', for it was an independent state — ruled by its 'States'. These 'provinces' federated in turn under 'The States General', but the latter could not over-rule any one 'province'. Each town was ruled by 'Regents'



through four burgomasters — and the Regents belonged to the *haute bourgeoisie*, who became a more and more exclusive clique. Here, of course, there is neither republic nor democracy. The common people, called 'the rabble' in those days, had no part whatever in government. Yet they could and did exercise indirect influence — at crises through riot, and at other times through the pamphleteer and the preacher. People, preachers and nobility all tended to support the House of Orange. Broadly speaking, the Orangist stood for increase in the central power, and the towns for a sturdy independence of it. In times of crisis, however, even the *haute bourgeoisie* turned to a Stadtholder — who needed to be appointed for *each* state — and he was always of the House of Orange. Along with all this there was the suspicion that the other states felt for the overtopping state of Holland (in the older sense of that name). It is a wonder that such a constitution, if such a word is fitting, ever worked at all! This fascinating book illustrates the saying that with good-will *any* constitution can be made to work. Dr. Renier does his best to be impartial, but he thinks that religion played no very large part in the revolt of the seventeenth century, and, while he gives a whole chapter to the Arminian controversy and admits in other ways that the Church played a large part in Dutch history, he cannot be said to show it much sympathy. This book, however, supplies the urgent need for an up-to-date study of Dutch history in English. One could wish that there had been a chapter about Holland under its constitutional monarchy. Dr. Renier has his own opinions on some subjects — for instance, he would reverse the statement that the nation makes the state.

#### BOOKLETS AND PAMPHLETS

The ruling idea in Dr. Gerald Broomfield's *Constitutional Episcopacy* (S.P.C.K., 6d.) is that a distinction should be made between authority to conserve (and to decide what shall be conserved) and authority to alter and add. As the former relates principally to 'faith and order', its exercise is the inalienable responsibility of bishops, but the latter should be exercised in conjunction with the clergy and, at least sometimes, in consultation with the laity. . . . The Epworth Press has issued three small collections of simple, sincere and unpretentious poems — two of them, Ruth Archibald's *Clarion Call* (1s. 6d.) and T. W. Bevan's *The Temple Road* (2s.), show how the Christian hope and the messages of nature ring clear even amid the din of war, while the other, *The Merchant of Heaven* (1s. 6d.), gives us the first-fruits of song, as distinct from hymns, in the Salvation Army. . . . The Christian way with other religions, even at their best, appears in the title of a booklet issued by the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, *The Inadequacy of Non-Christian Religion* (1s. 6d.). Seven writers, writing from the experience of work among the adherents of seven different faiths, show briefly but clearly how each comes short of the whole truth, and then the editor, Rev. H. A. Evan-Hopkins, deals at rather more length with the unique adequacy of Christianity. A good book for those who wonder whether all religions are not fundamentally the same. . . . If anyone seriously desires to use the Big Ben Minute for prayer, he will find much help in Dr. Eric Parsons' *A Time for Silence* (Epworth Press, 2s. 6d.). The author's examples make large use of that great manual for 'private devotion', the Methodist Hymn-book. . . . A man's occupation ought to be his vocation. In a series of ten broadcasts entitled *My Faith and My Job* (Epworth Press, 3s.) ten people show the way. In the list there are three parsons, an actor, a bomber station commander, a factory worker, a doctor, a teacher, a house-wife and a nurse.

#### ARTICLES IN PERIODICALS

Contractions: *E.T.* for *Expository Times* (T. & T. Clark, 1s.); *H.J.* for *Hibbert*

*Journal* (Allen & Unwin, 2s. 6d.); *H.T.R.* for *Harvard Theological Review* (Milford, \$1); *J.T.S.* for *Journal of Theological Studies* (Milford, 10s.); *P.* for *Presbyter* (J. Clarke, 3d.); *S.P.* for *Studies in Philology* (Univ. of North Carolina Press, \$2).

*Attic Orgeones, The*, by W. S. Ferguson (*H.T.R.*, April); *Christ and Public Opinion*, by W. H. Rigg (*E.T.*, Sept.); *Christian Life, An Inner Conflict in the*, by W. S. Urquhart (*H.J.*, July); *Church in a Planned Economy, The*, by J. R. Gray (*E.T.*, Nov.); *Comus, The Milieu of*, by G. F. Sensabough (*S.P.*, April); *Democracy and Leadership*, by J. W. Hunkin (*E.T.*, Oct.); *Didache, The 'Plot' of the*, by W. Telfer (*J.T.S.*, July); *Donne's Harshness and the Elisabethan Tradition*, by Arnold Stein (*S.P.*, July); *Egypt during the Roman Period, Evidences of Christianity in*, by H. J. Bell (*H.T.R.*, July); *Ezekiel, xl-xlviii, Prolegomena to*, by Campbell Mackay (*E.T.*, August); *Heroes, The Cult of*, by A. D. Knock (*H.T.R.*, April); *Humanism Militant* (Laski), by Alexander Miller (*P.*, Oct.); *John ii. 13-iii. 21 ('Displacement')*, by George Ogg (*E.T.*, December); *Luke and the Gospel of Paul, The Gospel of*, by T. E. Bleiben (*J.T.S.*, July); *Luther's Earliest Extant Sermon, The Significance of*, by H. S. Bluhm (*H.T.R.*, April); *Matthew and Luke Use a Western Text or Mark?*, *Did*, by C. S. C. Williams (*E.T.*, Nov.); *Milton and Hobbes*, by M. Wolfe (*S.P.*, July); *Ministry, The Archbishops' Commission on Training for the*, by R. Nichol Cross (*H.J.*, July); *Moffatt, James*, by A. J. Gossip (*E.T.*, Oct.); *Peace by Compulsion and Otherwise*, by L. P. Jacks (*H.J.*, July); *Philosophy, Faith and*, by D. M. MacKinnon (*P.*, July); *Presbyterian Answers to Congregationalism, A Catena of*, by A. N. Prior (*P.*, July); *Presbyterian Answers to Episcopacy, A Catena of*, by A. N. Prior (*P.*, Oct.); *Religion and Ethics*, by H. G. Wood (*E.T.*, December); *Renaissance Drama, Kingship in*, by Ruth L. Anderson (*S.P.*, April); *Sambathio*, by H. C. Youtie (*H.T.R.*, July); *Servant Songs, The so-called*, by Norman H. Snaith (*E.T.*, December); *Social Progress, Biblical Principles and*, by W. R. Matthews (*E.T.*, Aug.); *Sonship, The Divine*, by J. Burnaby (*J.T.S.*, July); *Swinburne's Use of Elisabethan Drama*, by G. C. Spiney (*S.P.*, April); *Tatian's Diatessaron, The Arabic Version of*, by P. R. Weis (*J.T.S.*, July); *Tetragrammaton in LXX, The*, by W. G. Waddell (*J.T.S.*, July); *Theology Emerging? Is an Ecumenical*, by T. D. Jenkins (*P.*, Oct.); *World Adrift, A*, by H. Wodehouse (*H.J.*, July); *United States in 1800, A.D., Religion in the*, by P. Oliver (*H.T.R.*, July); *Yahweh, The Council of*, by H. Wheeler Robinson (*J.T.S.*, July).

We have received a copy of the 403rd number of *Bibliotheca Sacra*, a theological quarterly issued by the Dallas Theological Seminary in Texas (60 cents per copy). Broadly speaking, its outlook may be called Fundamentalist. Its articles seek to elucidate the Scriptures. For instance, in this number (July, 1944), there is a part of an article on 'Anthropology' which examines Adam's state before he sinned, and one on 'The Political Duties of Christians' which draws its material chiefly from the Old Testament.